DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 344 244 CS 213 326

AUTHOR	Strickland, James, Ed.
TITLE	CSSEDC Quarterly. 1990.
INSTITUTION	National Council of Teachers of English, Urbana, Ill. Conference for Secondary School English Dept. Chairmen.
PUB DATE	90
NOTE	41p.
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - Serials (022)
JOURNAL CIT	CSSEDC Quarterly; v12 n1-4 Feb-Dec 1990
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Class Activities; Cooperating Teachers; Department Heads; English Departments; *English Instruction; Higher Education; High Schools; *Instructional Leadership; *Research Papers (Students); *Student Teaching; Teacher Evaluation; *Teacher Supervision
IDENTIFIERS	English Teachers

ABSTRACT

These four issues of the CSSEDC Quarterly (Conference for Secondary School English Department Chairpersons) represent the quarterly for 1990. Articles in number 1 deal with student teachers and include: "Student Teaching: Smoothing Out the Rough Spots" (Susan B. Argyle and Fred C. Feitler); "A Partnership for Urban Student Teaching" (Jerome T. Halpern); "Coping with the Paper Load" (Ruth Davis); and "Collaborative Learning for Teacher Education" (Phoebe Speck). Articles in number 2 discuss alternatives to the term paper and include: "Teaching Quantitative Research Writing: Or How I Stopped Hating the Paper and Learned to Love the Process" (Diana Y. Dreyer); "Research without the Waste of Time" (Carol Jago); "Real Research for Real Readers" (Mary G. Bernath); "The Two-Source Synthesis: The Heart of a Research Paper" (Dan Donlan); and "The Research Paper Redux" (Henry Kiernan). Number 3 deals with supervision and evaluation and includes: "To Be, Or Not To Be, a Second-Year Teacher" (Jane A. Zaharias and Kathleen T. Benghiat); "A Journal for Classroom Observations" (Carol Jago); "From Clinical to Collegial to Self-Directed: A Progressive Model of Supervision and Evaluation" (Susan Benjamin and Janice Jordan); "Supervision Means Recognition" (Betty C. Sisco); and "Leading with Imagination" (Paul C. Bellin). Articles in number 4 discuss leadership and include: "Leading Classroom Discussions" (Sharon Wieland); "Learning to Trust" (Rebecca Laubach); "Creating a Climate for Leadership" (Susan Benjamin); "Leadership through Reflective Thinking" (Jeanne Gerlach and Nancy Hoffman); "Leading Schoolwide Change: A Plan for Success" (Terrie St. Michel); "Continuing Concerns of Department Leaders" (Theodore Lehmann II); "Traditional and Romantic Views of Teachers" (Robert C. Small, Jr.); and "Team Building: Connecting Substance to Educational Leadership" (Henry Kiernan). (SR)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
James Strickland
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED344244

CSSEDC Quarterly

Volume 12, Number 1
February 1990
Editor: James Strickland

Conference for Secondary School English Department Chairpersons

In This Issue

STUDENT TEACHERS

by James Strickland, editor

This issue is devoted to student teachers, although it is impossible to consider student teachers without looking at their cooperating teachers as well. Cooperating teachers do much more than turn their classrooms over to student teachers, allowing them a place to practice their lessons; cooperating teachers should be mentors, guides, and heroes. The best ones are. Others, however, have forgotten what it feels like to enter a classroom full of strangers for the first time. Others have forgotten what a classroom feels like on the other side of the desk. But the best ones never forget.

My brother, Don, will tell you that he is a teacher today because of one man, the late George Rudman—his cooperating teacher. When Don was student teaching, George taught him what college education courses had not. George taught him how to conduct classes, the way a coach might—with encouragement, concern, and care. George taught him a lifetime's worth about good teaching: how to plan a lesson, one for a real classroom not a college course; how to involve students in a lesson; and how to adapt a lesson plan to take advantage of teachable moments. I guess my brother learned to be a teacher because his cooperating teacher let him be a teacher. This year, as Don greets and leads another student teacher, it will still be the hand of his own cooperating teacher guiding the way.

This issue shares some of the secrets of being a good cooperating teacher and looks at programs and practices designed to help student teachers.

The first article in this issue is by Susan Argyle, an assistant professor of education at Slippery Rock University who supervises student teachers in their field experience, and Fred Feitler, an associate professor at Kent State University and the coordinator of the Organization, Development and Change program. Their article speaks to cooperating teachers who feel the frustration of wanting to do a good job but are unsure of how to help. They offer practical suggestions about classroom planning, management, discipline, and communciation.

The second article is written by Jerome Halpern, a department chair at Langley High School in Pittsburgh. He writes about the need for student teachers, especially ones attending college in rural or small town locations, to have the experience of teaching in an urban school where many new teachers find their first jobs. He describes a Teaching Center that his school established for the student teachers of Indiana University of Pennsylvania.

In the third article, Ruth Davis, a former colleague now teaching at the Ankeny campus of Des Moines Area Community College, describes a project she conducted to give student teachers a chance to experience various methods of evaluating student writing.

The fourth article is written by Phoebe Speck, the director of the University School/John Carroll University Master's in Education Program. Phoebe describes their Teacher Education Program (TEP), an intern-style program where student teachers use their fifth year to earn a Master's degree and teaching certification.

Each of these authors advocates encouraging student teachers to see themselves as participants in the profession, a profession that exists outside the classroom as well as within.

Inside . . . **page number**

Student Teaching: Smoothing Out the Rough Spots . . 2
by Susan B. Argyle and Fred C. Feitler
A Partnership for Urban Student Teaching 4
by Jerome T. Halpern
Coping with the Paper Load 5
by Ruth Davis
Collaborative Learning for Teacher Education 6
by Phoebe Speck
CSSEDC News 7
Call for Manuscripts 7

It is the policy of NCTE in its journals and other publications to provide a forum for the open discussion of ideas concerning the content and the teaching of English and the language arts. Publicity accorded to any particular point of view does not imply endorsement by the Executive Committee, the Board of Directors, or the membership at large, except in announcements of policy where such endorsement is clearly specified. Copyright for articles published in *CSSEDC Quarterly* reverts to the respective authors.

CSSEDC Quarterly (ISSN 0738-1409) is published in October, December, February, and May by the National Council of Teachers of English, 1111 Kenyon Road, Urbana, Illinois 61801. Subscription price for the Conference for Secondary School English Department Chairpersons, $10.00 per year. Add $2.00 per year for Canadian and all other international postage. Single copy, $2.50 ($1.50 members). Remittances should be made payable to NCTE by check, money order, or bank draft in U.S. currency. Communications regarding change of address and permission to reprint should be addressed to the National Council of Teachers of English, 1111 Kenyon Road, Urbana, Illinois 61801.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CS213326

STUDENT TEACHING: SMOOTHING OUT THE ROUGH SPOTS

by Susan B. Argyle
Slippery Rock University, Pennsylvania,
and Fred C. Feitler
Kent State University, Ohio

Learning to teach inevitably occurs on the job; however, beginning teachers, including student teachers, often feel unprepared for the realities they encounter with their first classes. The somewhat traumatic nature of initial teaching experiences, for the master teacher as well as the novice who is sponsored, has been graphically described as reality shock. Learning to teach inevitably has its rough spots, moments that can prevent student teaching from being a satisfying experience for all parties concerned—the student teacher, the cooperating teacher, the university supervisor.

A Cycle of Misunderstanding

Sometimes, in trying to understand the dynamics of the student teacher/cooperating teacher relationship, the university supervisor may misdiagnose either the success or failure of a particular student-teaching situation. "My student teacher, Carole, is doing just fine. She shows promise and has a genuine liking for the students, especially the girls in the honors English class," comments Carole's cooperating classroom teacher, Mrs. Andrews, to Carole's university supervisor. Later, in the teachers' lounge, when Mrs. Andrews is having lunch with two colleagues, her comments are somewhat different: "My student teacher is the worst I've ever had. Those people at the university must not screen these kids at all! How'd she make it through the coursework?" The conversation continues with the three telling stories back and forth about incidents with student teachers. All point out the failure of the university program in training and selecting good people for student teaching, implying that each student teacher is representative of the program.

The cooperating teacher does not have a clear expectation of the level or content of preparation of the student teacher. Mrs. Andrews believes that the university has and should have prepared Carole to deal with situations such as the one that occurred earlier in the morning, a matter of classroom discipline. Because of her assumptions, Mrs. Andrews is unsure of how to discuss this issue with the student teacher or university supervisor. Should she be critical of Carole or of her undergraduate program? Should she assume that this was an isolated case or that Carole is unusually weak, compared with her peers? In either case, Mrs. Andrews—hoping for the best, believing it will not happen again—decides Carole just needs more time and nothing needs to be said. Since Mrs. Andrews has decided not to comment to Carole, she also decides not to bother the university supervisor either, thinking that "university people come down too hard sometimes." Consequently, Mrs. Andrews' letter of evaluation does not mention discipline as a weakness, since it was not discussed with Carole or her university supervisor.

In her desire to avoid conflict and confrontation, important issues have not been addressed. Mrs. Andrews rationalizes that the lunchtime conversation with her colleagues was an airing of the problem, although the student teacher was omitted from the feedback. The university supervisor is unaware of the problem and feels that any problems Carole has with managing the classroom must be minor, since the cooperating teacher has not commented otherwise. In her letter of evaluation, the university supervisor notes that Carole is progressing well, without any major deficiencies. The cycle is now complete but need not remain unbroken.

This article offers suggestions to cooperating teachers and university supervisors who wish to facilitate student teachers in effective planning, management, discipline, and communication.

Some Suggestions for Planning

Most student teachers have great visions of what their classroom will be like. However, when the time comes to squeeze out that first on-site written lesson plan, many student teachers produce something that is far from adequate. Early attempts to produce written plans usually result in something entirely too long or too short, too detailed or not detailed enough. On campus, the students may have only planned detailed single lessons from which they have never taught. They may arrive at their student-teaching site expecting to be shown or be told what to do, often sitting in the back of the classroom for several days before asking, "What do you want me to do?"

When secondary student teachers finally consult their cooperating teacher, they may be surprised to find that written plans are sketchy at best. Making a transition from graded lesson planning to planning for six or seven periods a day, without sufficient examples or discussion, may result in lessons without focus or logical sequence, uninspiring or nonexistent comprehension questions, and missing vital pieces such as introduction or summary. Additionally, planning by student teachers often excludes logistics about pacing, student and teacher movement in the classroom, and the physical arrangement.

Many master teachers have become sophisticated mental planners. They might try to explain to their student teachers how they go about putting a lesson together, thinking aloud, step-by-step, the mental checklist almost taken for granted. They might have their student teachers narrate their plans for a particular lesson prior to the teaching, encouraging them to create a physical checklist of the types of considerations modeled earlier. Cooperative teaching can be done in one of two ways: both might be active participants in the same lesson—agreeing who will play major and minor roles at an earlier planning session, reversing roles for a later lesson; or, a second option, the cooperating teacher might teach a lesson and have the student teacher attempt to copy the lesson with other students, later that same day if possible.

The cooperating teacher and the student teacher should anticipate possible problems together. They might decide how materials will be handed out, rehearse using the overhead and setting up the screen, identify students with academic or behavioral problems, and brainstorm, prior to the class period, a range of possible actions a student teacher might take if disruptions occur.

Many student teachers plan at the last minute. If the cooperating teacher insists upon checking over lesson plans a day in advance, the cooperating teacher can save a lesson. Discussion or asking appropriate questions can help an underdeveloped lesson become a completed whole. The student teacher needs to be asked, "What materials are needed? Are materials ready? What other discussion questions could be asked? How can students become actively involved throughout the lesson?"

Cooperating teachers should demand ambitious lessons. Student teaching is the right time for trial and error. A student teacher might be told to imagine that he or she is being considered for student-teacher-of-the-year and then be challenged to put together his or her most creative lesson.

Some Suggestions for Management

Teaching English at the junior high or high school level can be a wonderfully rewarding experience for a student teacher, or equal-

ly as destructive. Getting up in front of a classroom full of students who are not far removed in age from one's own peers can be intimidating enough, without the added task of illuminating the world of literature or teaching effective writing. Student teachers often become so intent upon the content of the lesson that they do not consider some commonsense management strategies that more experienced teachers take for granted.

Cooperating teachers should help student teachers become aware of the effect of their physical presence in the room. Student teachers have been known to become rooted in one spot or to imperceptibly shrink away from the class as the lesson progresses. Although moving around the room is not always possible, proximity control can be used strategically to maintain student attention, allowing the student teacher to move closer to disruptive students without interrupting the lesson.

Cooperating teachers can show student teachers how to make eye contact with students in the class. Student teachers should practice looking directly at students and moving to scan the group easily. Student teachers need to learn how to be more than simply visible, whether presenting lecture material or circulating to help individual students at their desks.

Cooperating teachers should encourage creative, nonjudgmental student/teacher interaction. As student teachers try to plan instruction that includes active participation, they often fall into the trap of creating a sense that there are "right" and "wrong" answers rather than discussion that allows for a wide variety of responses. Although the students may be involved, student teachers may lose rapport if students perceive that their responses are being judged.

Cooperating teachers can help student teachers develop and communicate expectations for student behavior. Student teachers should be encouraged to use anticipatory statements such as, "This is what I plan to do today," "This is what you will do for the next ten minutes," "This is how your homework should be completed," and "These are the three things I want you to address in your discussion group." Once expectations are clear, the student teacher can use other management strategies to see that students perform as requested.

Some Suggestions for Discipline

Cooperating teachers often comment on student teachers' lack of preparation for taking appropriate disciplinary action. At times the lack of disciplinary intervention by the student teacher demonstrates a belief system that differs from that of the cooperating teacher. But often, student teachers have not articulated their beliefs about discipline and do not know how to prepare for possible interruptions during teaching. The following suggestions are not as time-consuming as they might first appear and may possibly prevent some much more time-consuming, rectifying actions.

Cooperating teachers should be explicit in explaining their own rules or expectations for classroom behavior. Because discipline may be critically important to the success of the whole student teaching experience, time should be taken to discuss protocol for those who break classroom or general school conduct policies. Cooperating teachers can provide examples of a range of choices of actions for hypothetical or real situations using best and worst case scenarios.

Cooperating teachers can have the students in the class describe school and classroom expectations and policies to the student teacher. This allows students to orient the student teacher, who has already gained a knowledge base from the cooperating teacher. Students can see that the student teacher is interested and informed. Student teachers can also use this time to explain how certain expectations may differ during the time they are conducting class.

Cooperating teachers can have student teachers develop four or five general school-related questions to ask different students during study halls, lunch, or other logical times. Student teachers who may feel uncomfortable with high school students may relax after talking with some of the students one-to-one. These students often come to be the student teachers' greatest allies during problematic moments.

Before student teachers are fully involved in taking over teaching responsibilities, cooperating teachers can arrange for them to observe other English teachers in action. They might have them respond in writing to some of the following questions: What student misbehaviors occur? What was the teacher doing when misbehaviors occurred? How do teachers respond to student actions? What other ways could the teacher have addressed the incident? These written responses can be used to help student teachers select and design their own strategies for discipline.

Some Suggestions for Communication

Faulty communication lies beneath many problems that occur during student teaching. Telling student teachers that they are doing well to avoid hurt feelings or awkward university relations does a disservice to student teachers, students, cooperating teachers, and the teaching profession.

Cooperating teachers can write a quick feedback note daily to their student teachers by selecting, as specifically as possible, strengths and weaknesses of a lesson and writing alternating positive comments and suggestions, beginning and ending on an uplifting note.

Cooperating teachers can use audio or video recording of the student teacher. They might tape several lessons and have the student teacher select one of their lessons to view together. They might empower the student teacher to select stopping points for discussion, thereby controlling the viewing session. An early tape to compare with later lessons provides dramatic documentation of growth, and many student teachers even ask to copy or keep their video performances.

Cooperating teachers should describe rather than criticize student teacher behavior. Saying, "You stood in front of the desk for an hour" rather than "You don't move around" seems less judgmental and allows the student teacher to be reflective rather than defensive. Cooperating teachers might describe student behavior also, saying, "Lots of students answered your questions" rather than "You did much better." Improvement occurs in small steps and is fostered by awareness and recognition.

Conclusion

In the professional life span of a teacher, few periods of time compare in impact and importance with the initial teaching experiences. Whatever beginning teachers bring to their first teaching situation, that situation will have a powerful effect on them. Although student teachers are seldom as well prepared for teaching as we might ideally hope, cooperating teachers and university supervisors can help to strengthen student teachers' skills by concentrating on planning, management, discipline, and communication.

A PARTNERSHIP FOR URBAN STUDENT TEACHING

By Jerome T. Halpern
Langley High School, Pittsburgh

In response to the growing shortage of teachers in many of the large, multi-ethnic, urban school districts, Indiana University of Pennsylvania (IUP) contacted Langley High School, located in the city of Pittsburgh, concerning the possiblity of establishing an urban student-teaching experience. Its College of Education sought to help its student teachers who expressed an interest in doing their practice teaching in an urban setting, thereby preparing them for jobs in these urban areas.

In a related development, under the auspices of a Ford Foundation grant, the Pittsburgh School District began a collaboration with Duquesne University, the University of Pittsburgh, and IUP to study current teacher-training programs and to suggest new collaborative efforts in the area of teacher training. The Langley High School/IUP Urban Student Teacher Center, a center presently in its third year, was selected as the collaborative's pilot program for students pursuing a career in education through a traditional four-year program, and another high school was selected as the pilot program for the training of interns—students who are pursuing a teacher career as part of a five-year program or who are planning to enter the teaching profession through a graduate studies program.

The Collaborative Program

The School District/University Collaborative program promotes teaching as a decision-making process, striving to provide a safe environment in which the student teacher/intern can teach, analyze, and reflect on effective teaching. The program stresses the development of a sensitivity to the special nature of teaching in a multicultural urban setting, placing special emphasis on the development of human interaction skills necessary to function effectively with parents, students, and other professionals within a community.

The student teacher program at Langley and the intern program at the other high school share some major elements and approaches to accomplishing these goals. The teaching of the student teachers and interns is structured under what is called the TOP process. The theories (T) of effective instruction are presented; then the student teacher/interns are given the opportunity to focus their observations (O) of those theories in the teaching of their cooperating teachers; and, finally, they incorporate or practice (P) them within their own lessons.

Seminars for the cooperating teachers are held once a month during the school year. These seminars focus on the theories of effective instruction that are being taught to the student teachers and interns. The seminars also encourage the journal as a reflective activity for the cooperating teachers themselves, who in turn provide feedback in the evaluation of the program through these seminars and through ongoing journal-writing activities.

The Langley/IUP Program

Although student teachers in the Langley/IUP program spend the majority of their time during the first week with their cooperating teachers, they participate in a week-long orientation session during which they do not assume any teaching responsibilities. The session orients them to the building, explains and outlines program requirements, giving specific emphasis to a technical model used by cooperating teachers to provide formalized feedback to their student teachers, and offers seminars on writing objectives and lesson design. As part of the orientation, student teachers observe their cooperating teachers and one other teacher for three or four consecutive days, focusing on the elements of classroom management used to establish basic classroom discipline and operating procedures.

In the second week, the student teachers begin teaching, with responsibility for no more than one class. They are assigned additional classes as more competence and maturity are demonstrated. A full schedule of classes is only assumed on recommendation of the cooperating teacher and university supervisor, and with the approval of the Langley program coordinator.

The student teachers obviously observe their own cooperating teacher frequently, but they are also exposed to a broad range of teaching styles, teachers, and content areas other than their own. During the course of the semester each student teacher does a minimum of eight additional focused observations of teachers other than the cooperating teacher. Some additional observations may be required as part of a clinic or group observation. Student teachers are also given the opportunity to observe their own teaching through the use of videotaping.

The student teacher continues to be observed by the university supervisor in accordance with university requirements and is formally observed by the cooperating teacher at least twice a week using their technical feedback model. The student teacher may be observed and receive additional feedback from the Langley principal, vice principals, district content supervisors, various department chairpersons, center program coordinators, and other Langley teachers.

Student teachers are expected to participate in other professional activities with their cooperating teachers such as monthly faculty meetings, weekly department meetings, and other district inservice programs. In addition, during the course of the semester they are encouraged to become familiar with the duties and functions of various other school personnel. This may be accomplished by shadowing school personnel such as a school counselor or a vice principal for an appropriate length of time during their cooperating teacher's duty period. In order to gain the broadest perspective possible of a teacher's responsibilities, student teachers are also encouraged to participate in sports and other school extracurricular activities.

Student teachers participate in a formal seminar program for which they may receive university credit. The weekly, hour-and-a-half seminar is conducted at Langley by in-building and other school district personnel. The chairperson of the special education department, for example, presents a seminar on integrating special needs students; a Langley science teacher gives several lessons on classroom management and preventive discipline techniques; and another Langley teacher presents seminars on lesson design and writing objectives. At various times the city's superintendent, deputy superintendent, school district solicitor, personnel director, and the teachers' union president have presented these seminars.

Another component of the program provides the student teacher with a broad range of experiences which are external to the school itself—opportunities to visit the district's professional library, various special schools, other special magnet and gifted programs, and the district's special school for the severely handicapped.

The last period of each day at Langley is set aside as a professional interaction period, a time to participate in professional and personal development activities. Student teachers are given the opportunity to reflect on their teaching in their journals and to interact in informal discussions with other student teachers

and members of Langley's professional staff. Student teachers have come to value this particular aspect of the program most—meeting, sharing successes and failures, and exploring common concerns and problems with other student teachers who are experiencing the same things. Each group that has gone through the center at Langley has seemed to "come together" during this time, established friendships, and formed a support group which has contributed significantly and meaningfully to their own stability, confidence, and professional interaction.

Impact of the Program

In the first two years of its operation, approximately forty-five student teachers have gone through the program at Langley. The staff at Langley has begun to develop some depth and special expertise in the training of student teachers. No longer preoccupied with just the development and implementation of the program, the staff is beginning to take a much closer look at just what we are learning about the student-teaching process and how it might be developed and restructured to be even more effective.

Our student teachers have had a unique experience; they have practiced in a school and a program which has provided them with a special focus on urban, multicultural education. They have not been closed up behind the doors of classrooms, left with solitary input and their own individual learning ability. Rather, they have been nurtured in an atmosphere fostering interaction with their peers and with other professionals. Their initiation has not been one which has channeled them into the narrow focus of survival in their own classroom, but into a pedagogical world which has shown them the wide variety of resources, particularly their own peers and colleagues, available to them to make the most of their learning experiences.

COPING WITH THE PAPER LOAD

by Ruth Davis
Des Moines Area Community College, Iowa

English education students may have been warned of the immense paper load they will face in their classrooms; however, many have trouble imagining the range of abilities—and disabilities—student papers reflect. Furthermore, student teachers and new teachers are used to reading essays by their classmates—other English education majors—and, consequently, may be unprepared for the aimless, nonspecific, and grammatically confused papers that are sometimes handed in by their students.

How does the new secondary school English teacher cope with the paper load—providing helpful feedback to students, still leaving time for preparing lessons, keeping records, developing professionally, and maintaining a personal life?

What do experienced teachers do? Experienced teachers share their teaching and evaluation techniques with each other—informally or through inserice programs. Thus, it seems logical that student teachers could benefit from such sharing before they first meet with their own classes. Two such forms of sharing might be to offer English education majors practice in evaluation and collaborative discussions with secondary teachers.

Evaluation Practice

At Bowling Green State University, Ohio, I offered fourteen English education majors the opportunity to participate in an essay evaluation experience—grading essays in a research project. The students were mostly juniors and seniors enrolled in a grammar and composition course for English majors planning to teach. Thus, within a year or two, most would be evaluating papers for their own secondary school students. As part of this research project, they were able to gain experience evaluating real essays from both regular and developmental freshman composition classes.

Evaluation Techniques

In preparing themselves for the paper load, the English education majors were interested in the advantages and disadvantages of the two grading techniques used in the project: holistic grading and simplified primary trait grading. Holistic scores are assigned after a rapid reading of the essay and represent the reader's evaluation of the whole essay—thus, the term "holistic." One advantage of holistic grading is that it is a quick way to evaluate the over-all effectivenes of an essay, making it useful for research comparing hundreds or thousands of papers—for example, an advanced placement test for English. An obvious disadvantage of holistic grading is that it does not explain why readers rated essays high or low.

Primary trait scoring, the second method used in the project, offers a more explicit rating as readers rate or comment on a few (usually four to six) components of the writing—perhaps unity, coherence, evidence, sentence structure, and mechanics.

The essay evaluation method used in the Bowling Green State University project was a modified holistic grading, marrying holistic rating with simplified primary trait scoring, providing broad indications of why readers rated essays as they did, rating each essay with a holistic score and with a score for two traits: organization/development and sentence structure/mechanics.

The Evaluation Experience

At a training session, English education majors received copies of four assignments that each of sixty-two freshmen in two regular and two developmental composition classes had completed. The types of assignments were ones similiar to those secondary teachers might assign: problem solving, comparison-contrast, process analysis, and response to an essay. The English education majors evaluated a practice packet including essays written by students other than those in the experiment but in response to the same assignments. The essays displayed varied ability levels. Readers evaluated the first essay, then tabulated ratings and discussed their reasons for assigning those ratings. This procedure was repeated several times during the session. Soon most English education majors were agreeing within one rating—just as more experienced readers at training sessions have been able to do.

Adapting Holistic and Primary Trait Grading to the Classroom

Weighing the advantages and disadvantages of various evaluation methods led the English education majors to inquire how the modified holistic grading used in the experiment could be adapted to the classroom, while still giving students needed feedback. For occasional short assignments with a single goal (writing a well-unified paragraph, for instance), a holistic score alone might be adequate, if the teacher copied several students' paragraphs, provided sample revisions of those paragraphs, and discussed the changes with the class before students rewrote their paragraphs.

Most of the time, writers need more than a holistic score or grade in order to revise essays or to improve future ones. Even the two primary trait scores used in the project would not provide the precise indications of strengths and weaknesses needed to guide essay writers in an effective revision. In the classroom, it would be better to include a few precise comments. For example, a

teacher might make one comment of praise and one suggestion for improvement or perhaps comment on one specific aspect of organization/development and on one specific aspect of sentence structure/mechanics. Another way to limit comments is to deal with writing techniques currently being emphasized in class.

Yet another possibility might be giving writers a holistic grade/score on most of their papers but once every few weeks marking a paper for all aspects of good writing. Writers would get periodic feedback on both organization/development and sentence structure/mechanics and could practice writing regularly. The new teacher would not be overwhelmed making detailed comments on every paper and, thus, would have time to comment and discuss papers with writers soon after they were submitted—while the requirements of the assignment are still clear for both writers and teacher. The writers would also benefit because the periodic, comprehensively marked papers would prepare them to pay attention to and balance all aspects of a written communication while the less comprehensively graded papers would allow them to concentrate on developing one (or a few) skills at a time without being overwhelmed by everything.

The English education majors and I discussed ways to balance the emphasis on organization/development with the emphasis on sentence structure/mechanics. We acknowledged the need to help students recognize and correct sentence structure and mechanics problems because these problems confuse readers and detract from the points the writer is trying to make. We also noted the danger of spending so much time on sentence-level matters that students do not learn to organize a clear, logical argument and to develop it with concrete examples, statistics, quotations, definitions and explanations.

Collaborative Discussions with Secondary Teachers

In addition to gaining useful experience in evaluating essays, English education majors had an opportunity to discuss writing concerns as part of a professional community.

Though these fourteen students responded well to the essay evaluation project, it seems that similar exchanges involving high school faculty and high school essays could benefit future teachers even more. Such exchanges would show students essays more like ones their students would write. Perhaps a high school teacher could duplicate a set of essays that the English education majors could evaluate and then discuss in their class. Even better would be inviting high school teachers to participate in the discussion. Then the English education majors could ask the teachers about their objectives for the essay assignment(s) and discuss their own evaluations with someone currently teaching high school students. They could compare their course instructor's and a high school teacher's views. If this exchange could not be scheduled during class time, it might be a Saturday or evening session offered as one of several learning project options for the class.

Another variation might be for English education majors to act as an outside audience for a set of essays—perhaps on two or more drafts. High school students could get feedback then from one or more outside readers (in addition to their teacher's comments). The English education majors would be closer to a real audience in that they would be reading the essays with little knowledge of the students and of the people and events the high school writers were writing about. Thus, the high school writers would need to be more explicit than for classmates (and even for the teacher) who would be more likely to have first-hand knowledge of the people, places, and events the students wrote about. If a conference between readers and high school writers could be arranged before the revision, students could ask questions about the comments, and the college students could practice conferencing skills and begin to understand firsthand the need for tactful, clear, honest comments. Thus, high school students would benefit while the college students practiced evaluation techniques they would need later in their profession.

How does the new secondary school teacher cope with the paper load? Evaluation experience and discussion with English teachers (and perhaps with high school students themselves) are two ways of helping future teachers answer that question.

COLLABORATIVE LEARNING FOR TEACHER EDUCATION

by Phoebe Speck
University School, Shaker Heights, Ohio

Our Teacher Education Program (TEP), offered jointly by the University School and John Carroll University, is an intensive, year-long, clinically based program resulting in a Master of Education degree and state certification in elementary education (K–8). Plans are under way, however, to expand the program into the secondary school. Our program provides professional training that is intellectually demanding and sufficiently stimulating to attract high-calibre, liberal arts graduates to classroom teaching.

Structure of the Program

The TEP program includes a daily classroom apprenticeship linked to the study of theory, moving prospective teachers from a passive to an active role. Student teachers begin as observers, become assistants, and finally assume full responsibility for the classroom. This progression is not unusual, but the collaborative relationship between school personnel, university faculty, and student teachers is unique and does serve to foster collective growth. Furthermore, the student teachers effectively come to understand how children learn, through understanding their styles and interest in learning, as well as through designing curriculum.

The TEP program takes into account what is known about adult learners and applies it to teacher preparation. Collaborative learning and functioning as part of a community are important to adult learners. Immersion allows for comprehensive understanding of the school as a culture. To understand schooling, a student teacher needs to see the institution as both an individual unit and part of a system. Moreover, spending their days in one school setting and becoming an integral part of its workings satisfies the need to learn from the inside out. An urban school visitation program is designed to broaden the student teacher's perspective and to prepare the teacher to participate in any system.

Because adult learners bring to the school setting certain beliefs and attitudes, the program examines these predispositions and moves beyond surface beliefs to a deeper and broader understanding of the education of a child. Through school-based seminars, student teachers are encouraged to see the connectedness of the curriculum and the centrality of the learner to the development of the classroom experience.

At a recent advisement session, held every other week, one of the student teachers remarked, "Through observing my cooperating teacher and the class, I learn so much every day. Everything I read about is coming alive in the classroom." Another stated, "I never realized how complex a teacher's job really is on a daily basis. The responsibilities of teaching are unending. Everything you do and say is important, and you never stop learning!" Other comments included, "I love our group. We share so much and learn from each other. How did you know we would mix so well together?" "This program is tough; there is so little time for

anything else is my life, but I would not change a minute of it . . . except maybe for media lab!"

The faculty regard the student teachers more as colleagues than as apprentices. The administration actively includes them in the life of the school. The student teachers are frequently seen in the faculty lounge informally chatting about curriculum with their cooperating teachers, sharing activities that might be appropriate for the coming week or ones that they will be guiding. As the student teachers gradually implement their plans in the classrooms, their confidence, expertise, and excitement in learning flourishes.

The TEP program also helps faculty to develop skills in working with adults. The following are frequent questions asked by cooperating teachers: How can I present material so that the graduate students experience the learning process as children in my classroom do? How can my questions help a student teacher to be a more focused observer of student behavior and of the subtleties of the teacher's role? Am I stepping back and observing the student teacher effectively? Is the student teacher given sufficient opportunity to communicate personal understandings—Are my questions encouraging the student to confront biases and make new discoveries? Am I also helping to strengthen a student's self-confidence in dealing with a myriad of new experiences and a great deal of new information?

As faculty collaborate with student teachers, they become more articulate in their planning. They need to be able to answer the question "Why?" and to relate theory to practice with precision rather than with vague generalities. The faculty constantly place the individual experiences offered to children in the context of the larger whole: the curricular framework that is designed to offer students a coherent picture.

At the same time, the faculty enjoy another pair of eyes, and sometimes hands, in the classroom. They find their student teacher's observations and perceptions invaluable. One faculty member stated, "It is also fun to have someone to talk with, share with, and plan with. This helps guard against a sense of isolation in the classroom. Some faculty even find a sense of accomplishment in assisting their profession by helping an adult learn who in turn will facilitate student learning—despite the extra time and effort involved on the part of the faculty."

Little doubt exists that life changes within the classroom with the presence of student teachers. New ideas for projects and curriculum emanate from the student teacher and serve the children. The children come to see the student teachers as valued resources with whom they share the joys and/or frustrations of discovery. Throughout the year, as the student teachers learn through observation and teaching, the children benefit from the insights revealed by the studies conducted by the student teachers, from the ideas contributed to the curriculum by the student teachers, from the opportunities to interact with more adults, and from the experience year upon year of teachers watching others engaged in the learning process. The school becomes a place that truly nurtures and encourages the learning process; coaching becomes a way of life.

In sum, I truly believe that our teacher education program is special. To date we have a 98 percent success rate for placement after graduation, and we are receiving requests from many other schools to visit and see our program in action.

CSSEDC News

At its twenty-first annual convention, the Conference for Secondary School English Department Chairpersons met at the Hyatt Regency Hotel in Baltimore, Maryland, with the theme "Diversity Now and Into the Twenty-first Century." An election held during the first day of the convention filled two vacancies on the executive committee created by the expiration of the terms of Mary Sue Gardetto of Beavercreek, Ohio, and Mary Ellen Thornton of Houston, Texas, members-at-large. Susan Benjamin of Highland Park, Illinois, and Thomas Fischer of La Grange, Illinois, were elected members-at-large.

The third annual CSSEDC award for the best article published during the preceding year was presented at the NCTE opening session for the Secondary Section to Shirley Lyster for her article "Departmental Aerobics: Stretching Professional Muscles." The article was chosen not only for its message and its writing quality, but also for its having something to say of special concern to chairs. The judges for the award were Wendell Schwartz of Prairie View, Illinois, Judith Kelly of Washington, D.C., Donald Stephan of Sidney, Ohio, and Anne Picone of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

CALLS FOR MANUSCRIPTS—PLANS FOR FUTURE ISSUES

The *CSSEDC Quarterly*, a publication of the Conference for Secondary School English Department Chairpersons of NCTE, seeks articles of 250–3,000 words on topics of interest to English department leaders. Informal, firsthand accounts of successful department activities are encouraged.

Recent surveys of our readers reveal these topics of interest: leadership training for the new department chair, class size/class load, support from the business community, at-risk student programs, problems for rural schools, reading/writing centers, and whole language curriculum. Short articles on these and other concerns are published in every issue. In addition, upcoming issues will have these themes:

October 1990 (July 1 deadline):
Supervision/Observation/Evaluation

December 1990 (September 15 deadline):
Effective Leadership

February 1991 (November 1 deadline):
Whole Language in the High School

May 1991 (February 1 deadline):
The Learning Labels: At-risk; LD; Dyslexia; Remedial

Manuscripts may be sent on 5.25- or 3.5-inch floppy disks, with IBM compatible ASCII files or as traditional double-spaced, typed copy.

Address articles and inquiries to: James Strickland, editor, *CSSEDC Quarterly*, English Department, Slippery Rock University of Pennsylvania, 16057-1326.

NCTE SEEKS EXCELLENT LANGUAGE ARTS PROGRAMS FOR STUDENTS AT RISK

In the belief that sound, supportive language arts programs encourage students at risk to stay in school, the National Council of Teachers of English has focused its next search for Centers of Excellence—high-quality elementary and secondary school teaching programs—on these students. With a $50,000 grant from the Sears Foundation, NCTE has begun a new nationwide search for language arts programs designed to meet their educational needs. Its aim is to spread the word about practices that are proving effective in motivating at-risk students and helping them to become competent readers, writers, speakers, and listeners.

When the search is completed, a national list of schools designated in 1990 as Centers of Excellence will be published. Those schools will provide written materials to help educators adapt their successful approaches for use in other schools. They will also open their programs to visits from educators seeking ideas for teaching students at risk. Within each state, one Center will be recognized as a "lead" school program, which will be eligible for selection as one of five representative programs to be recognized nationally.

The Centers of Excellence Program will define "at risk" broadly to include youth from a cross-section of cultural and linguistic backgrounds, students living in poverty in urban, rural, or suburban areas, and youth with developmental disabilities.

Schools with programs focused on the needs and potential of students at risk are invited to submit descriptions of their programs to be considered for designation as Centers of Excellence. The deadline for returning application forms is February 15, 1990. From the descriptions submitted, an NCTE committee will choose programs to be observed in action by qualified validators. The final selection will be made by the committee from validators' reports. The timetable for the Centers of Excellence search, which since its inception in 1985 has been conducted every two years, will be accelerated to complete the new program during calendar 1990.

Among the criteria on which 1990 Centers of Excellence for Students at Risk will be judged are these: A teacher or teachers have been closely involved in developing the English language arts program. The program is consistent with sound theory and, where applicable, appropriate research. The program meets special needs in language for at-risk students. It provides a balanced English language arts experience (reading, writing, listening, speaking, thinking). The program has been in operation for at least one school year. The program provides, if possible, multiple opportunities for students of varying abilities and educational backgrounds to work and learn together. The program's goals are appropriately high for at-risk students. The program seeks to foster self-esteem and to enable students to move to the next level. The program may incorporate innovative or imaginative approaches to teaching and learning.

Special consideration will be given to the program if it includes parental or community involvement.

The timetable for the 1990 search calls for preliminary selection of Center of Excellence candidates from completed applications by March 1, 1990; for receipt of additional information from schools by May 1; and for completion of validation visits by June 1. The expected date for notifying directors of programs selected as Centers is July 1, 1990.

Teachers in programs for students at risk may apply for recognition under the Centers of Excellence program by calling or writing the National Council of Teachers of English for application forms. Address requests to: 1990 Centers of Excellence for Students at Risk, NCTE, 1111 Kenyon Road, Urbana, IL 61801. Phone: (217) 328-3870. Applications for recognition under this new program must be received by February 15, 1990.

CSSEDC Executive Committee

Chair
Wendell Schwartz
Stevenson High School
16070 West Highway 22
Prairie View, Illinois 60069

Associate Chair
Myles Eley
Warren Central High School
9500 East 16th Street
Indianapolis, Indiana 46229

Past Chair
Emil J. Sanzari
Paramus High School
East Century Road
Paramus, New Jersey 07652

Liaison to NCTE Secondary Section Committee
Carol Compton
Hudson High School
Hudson, Massachusetts 01749

Corresponding Secretary
Susan Hayles-Berbower
Huntington Beach UHSD
10251 Yorktown Avenue
Huntington Beach, CA 92646

Membership Chair
Thomas Jones
Wyoming Valley West High School
Wadham Street
Plymouth, Pennsylvania 18651

Secretary-Treasurer
Miles Myers
NCTE

Staff Liaison
L. Jane Christensen
NCTE

Members-at-Large
Susan Benjamin
Highland Park High School
433 Vine
Highland Park, Illinois 60035

Thomas Fischer
Lyons Township High School
100 S. Brainard Avenue
La Grange, Illinois 60525

Ira Hayes
Syosset High School
South Woods Road
Syosset, New York 11791

Judith M. Kelly
Hine Junior High School
8th and Pennsylvania Avenue, SE
Washington, DC 20003

Deborah Smith McCullar
Dean Morgan Junior High School
1440 S. Elm
Casper, Wyoming 82601

Kevin C. McHugh
Finneytown Jr./Sr. High School
8916 Fountainebleau Terrace
Cincinnati, Ohio 45231

CSSEDC QUARTERLY
National Council of Teachers of English
1111 Kenyon Road
Urbana, Illinois 61801

Nonprofit
Organization
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
Champaign, Illinois
Permit No. 85

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CSSEDC Quarterly

Conference for Secondary School English Department Chairpersons

Volume 12, Number 2
May 1990
Editor: James Strickland

In This Issue

ALTERNATIVES TO THE TERM PAPER

by James Strickland, editor

In an earlier column, I related an anecdote concerning what high school English teachers could do to better prepare their students for college. My advice at the time was simple: stop teaching the term paper. Carol Jago, a teacher at Santa Monica High School in California, responded and wrote that she agreed, adding that she had already stopped teaching the traditional term paper. I wrote back and asked her to tell me more, suggesting that "Alternatives to the Term Paper" might make an interesting topic. Consequently, Carol Jago is one of the authors featured in this issue. She offers an alternative to the traditional "waste-of-time" term paper, an alternative that grew out of a reading her students enjoyed.

Others apparently agreed. Each of the other authors in this issue provides alternatives, all of them better ways to use the time and energy previously devoted to teaching the traditional term paper.

Diana Dreyer suggests teaching quantitative investigation, activities which result in a research product looking more like what a term paper is supposed to look like in the first place. A colleague and an assistant professor of English at Slippery Rock University, Diana Dreyer is a master teacher, of which you will be convinced by the student-centered procedures she describes. It is no coincidence that I recommend her to my students as someone from whom they will learn their tuition's worth.

In another article, Mary Bernath, an associate professor at Bloomsburg University of Pennsylvania, writes of an approach that ties research to a writer's natural curiosity. The spark that fires her alternative approach is the *New Yorker* magazine, the required textbook for her research writing course. Weekly, her students enter a world of quality nonfiction, researched writing that they enjoy, analyze, and model.

The fourth article is written by Dan Donlan, a former high school teacher and department chair at Modesto High School, who now teaches at the University of California at Riverside. Dan writes about his success teaching one aspect of researched writing, the two-source synthesis. He feels, as do the others in this issue, that time spent teaching footnotes and notecards is better spent integrating information from sources into personal language and by internalizing the meaning of what has been read.

Henry Kiernan, author of the final article, is a high school teacher at Southern Regional High School in Manahawkin, New Jersey. Henry provides some recommendations to transform the current thesis-driven model of the research paper into a design based on student-generated questions, one enabling students to set a research agenda and to make the kind of choices real research writers make.

Perhaps it would not hurt to listen to ourselves. The term paper is, in our own words, "the dreaded term paper," the "much-bemoaned term paper," and "an invented-for-school torture." The time is right to consider alternatives.

Inside . . . **page number**

Teaching Quantitative Research Writing: Or How I Stopped Hating the Paper and Learned to Love the Process 2
by Diana Y. Dreyer

Research without the Waste of Time 3
by Carol Jago

Real Research for Real Readers 3
by Mary G. Bernath

The Two-Source Synthesis: The Heart of a Research Paper 6
by Dan Donlan

The Research Paper Redux 7
by Henry Kiernan

Calls for Manuscripts 7

It is the policy of NCTE in its journals and other publications to provide a forum for the open discussion of ideas concerning the content and the teaching of English and the language arts. Publicity accorded to any particular point of view does not imply endorsement by the Executive Committee, the Board of Directors, or the membership at large, except in announcements of policy where such endorsement is clearly specified. Copyright for articles published in *CSSEDC Quarterly* reverts to the respective authors.

CSSEDC Quarterly (ISSN 0738-1409) is published in October, December, February, and May by the National Council of Teachers of English, 1111 Kenyon Road, Urbana, Illinois 61801. Subscription price for the Conference for Secondary School English Department Chairpersons, $10.00 per year. Add $2.00 per year for Canadian and all other international postage. Single copy, $2.50 ($1.50 members). Remittances should be made payable to NCTE by check, money order, or bank draft in U.S. currency. Communications regarding change of address and permission to reprint should be addressed to the National Council of Teachers of English, 1111 Kenyon Road, Urbana, Illinois 61801.

TEACHING QUANTITATIVE RESEARCH WRITING: OR HOW I STOPPED HATING THE PAPER AND LEARNED TO LOVE THE PROCESS

by Diana Y. Dreyer
Slippery Rock University of Pennsylvania

A few years ago, I turned my grades in for a required first-year research writing course, wondering what had gone wrong, a thought that had crossed my mind at the end of previous semesters. The students and I had both "worked real hard," but their final products—the much-bemoaned research paper—represented chaos: tangled phrases, lack of focus, unconventional documentation, intended and unintended plagiarism—well, you know what I mean. At that point, I vowed to make changes in my approach to research writing, both for my students' well being and my sanity.

One outcome of this vow was getting students involved in different kinds of research methodology, in particular, focusing on both quantitative and qualitative research. I would like to share some of the features of the quantitative project, named thus for the very elementary statistical analysis students do on the data they collect from a self-styled questionnaire distributed to a number of respondents.

Locating a Topic

As a topic locator, I use an adapted version of the composing exercise of Tom Reigstad and Don McAndrew *(Training Tutors for Writing Conferences,* ERIC/NCTE, 1984, pp. 12-13), first asking students to brainstorm a list of twenty to twenty-five problems that they experience or observe, either here on campus or in their home community. One student—a long-haired, granny-spectacled, black-jacketed biker—listed general concerns such as garbage disposal, motorcycling, health costs, campus parking, funding a college education, teen gangs, adolescent use of leisure time in small towns, and construction of energy-saving houses.

Next, I ask students to circle the most surprising or interesting thing on the initial list and then to make a second list: specific details about the circled item. The aforesaid biker circled motorcycling on the first list, breaking that topic down into subtopics such as purchasing, maintenance, safety, helmet laws, biking clubs, image, licensing requirements, and racing.

Focusing

Finally, students take an item from the second list and do a freewrite on the already narrowed topic. My biker finished this exercise with a freewrite on helmet laws in Pennsylvania, clearly spelling out his unhappiness with the existing requirement, providing a then undocumented rationale for change. I am always agreeably surprised at such thoughtfully generated topics and how successfully the majority of them turn out to be quite suitable for research purposes. And the students are even more agreeably surprised with their self-selected topics—areas of concern for them, ones they sometimes prematurely label as no good because they believe that only certain academic topics are research fodder. Later they surprise themselves anew as their visits to the library provide so much material on these topics that the focus of their paper needs additional narrowing.

I have guided students through the process of questionnaire development, distribution, and tallying with help from Robert Axelrod and Charles Cooper's *St. Martin's Guide to Writing* (2nd ed., St. Martin's Press, 1988, pp. 525–32).

Axelrod and Cooper explain how to focus on and write pertinent questions, offering examples of both closed questions (multiple choice) and open questions (completion), pointing out the utility of each. They also provide helpful advice on designing and ordering a questionnaire, testing and revising it, and writing up the results, the latter demonstrating how to tally and summarize both closed and open questions.

My biking aficionado, incidentally, completed a well-balanced argument of the paper's thesis, supported by a wealth of statistics generated by data collected from both pro-and anti-helmet groups. He definitely changed the rather fuzzily formed opinion I'd held on this topic up to that time. I was surprised anew. And this college writer has plans to submit the research to a biking periodical, aware now that an audience is available for such research beyond the one of teacher as reader/evaluator.

The Research Paper

What follows is the general outline of the six parts of the quantitative research paper itself: Statement of the Problem, Significance of the Problem, Review of Related Research, Procedure, Results/Conclusion, and Appendix.

Statement of the Problem. Here I ask students to define their problem, including a context: that is, an explanation of to whom, when, and where it occurs. This section should also spell out just what the research questions are that such a study might be expected to answer, as well as a hypothesis or what students expect to find during the course of the project.

Significance of the Problem. In this section, I direct students to consider just why this problem merits their research, asking them also to ponder the problem's causes and effects, its relationship to comparable or contrastable problems, and some examples of the problem.

Review of Related Literature. At this point students summarize their library findings. Prior to the students' writing of this review, we spend inclass and out-of-class time developing precis on articles from a reader we use, *Language Awareness* (Eschholz, Rosa, and Clark, 4th ed. St. Martin's Press, 1986). Particularly useful for this kind of writing are Margaret Woodworth's (1988) suggestions in "The Rhetorical Precis" (*Rhetoric Review,* 7: 156–64), detailing an elegant little summary format, one students report as a godsend for other courses and research projects as well. Woodworth outlines a four-sentence summary of a written piece, beginning with one containing the author's name, title of work, year of publication, genre, rhetorically accurate verb, and a "that" clause explaining the main point or thesis which the writer expresses. The second sentence again references the author, telling how the author develops the ideas. (Students assigned to abstract a piece in greater length can add further information at this point.) The third sentence explains the author's purpose, concluding with an "in order to" phrase, requiring precis writers to do more than merely summarize. The final sentence refers to the author's intended audience and the relationship the author attempts to establish with such an audience.

I admit, when I first came across this format, I thought it was heavily formulaic; however, I now see it as another useful heuristic, a strategy generating an infinite variety of versions, a format most students can whip off easily after a semester's use and practice.

An example of such a precis of the article you're now reading follows. Dreyer's article, "Teaching Quantitative Research Writing" (1990), details a procedure for teaching quantitative research writing skills that can ease the oft-dreaded process for both students and teachers. She develops her point by outlining the process that she's found successful, illustrating it with a mini-case study

of one of her students. Her purpose is to share a classroom technique in order to assist beginning or jaded teachers of writing and their students. She establishes an informal relationship with her audience, those concerned with teaching the research process and its reporting.

Procedure (methodology). I ask students to consider what they hope to find, whom they should query and where, and what specific questions will reveal what they're looking for. This section, then, is a description of the development of the questionnaire, its respondents, administration, and results, an activity heightening students' sense of how quantitative research operates, as well as their involvement and ownership in their project.

Results/Conclusions. In this concluding section of the paper itself, I ask students to summarize the results of their survey, explaining the significance and possible interpretations of their findings and how this information fits in with related research, data gathered from other sources such as the library. I also urge them to consider the implications of their research and the possibilities for reducing or eliminating the problem in question altogether.

Appendix. Following the text of the paper, I have students include a clean copy of their questionnaire and a data display—charts or tables illustrating the results of their questionnaire. I am usually impressed with the colorful originality of their graphics. Needless to say, a works cited page concludes the entire project.

For the last couple of semesters, I have turned in grades for the research writing course with a smile on my face, satisfied that the students and I have not only "worked real hard" but have also produced very satisfactory results for this effort: readable papers, ones enhanced by a sense of ownership generated by the way they handled the procedures; a familiarity with the format of published quantitative research; an increased awareness of our library's holdings—the number and variety of periodicals and resources available; and, for a majority of the students, a reduced sense of writing apprehension.

RESEARCH WITHOUT THE WASTE OF TIME

by Carol Jago
Santa Monica High School, California

This month, eleven percent of the time we have with students will be spent doing carefully structured busy work—the research paper, an assignment appearing in the course description of most high school English classes, an assignment usually allowed a four-to-six-week time frame for its completion.

Why do high school teachers cling to this dinosaur? The research paper does not prepare students for the analytic writing demanded in first-year college courses. The research paper does not develop fluency in writing or reading. My students wrote less, not more, while working on term papers.

Neither were they reading very much, despite the tonnage they checked out from the library; they were too busy copying passages onto index cards (3- x 5-inch only, please). Attention to the finished product and its form seems to be the primary concern. As to motivation, high school students have always written term papers in the spring. Besides, students choose their own topics, don't they?

After reading more research papers than I care to recall, papers detailing the ways dolphins communicate or the life of Edgar Allan Poe, I finally asked myself, why are we doing this? Perhaps it is that parents seem to like the assignment. The finished product looks so tidy—just like the papers they used to write when they were in school. Never mind that the papers are composed of awkwardly spliced pieces from widely varied sources and contain the most voiceless prose the students generate all year.

I abandoned the dreaded assignment. I did so quietly because the research paper remains in the small print of the course outline, but I could no longer face putting my students through the pointless paces. Certainly I want students to know how to find answers to real questions, and I know the value of products for closure, but the typical high school research paper simply wastes too much class time for too little learning.

To replace this project, I substituted research based upon a text we study in class. At the conclusion of Maxine Hong Kingston's *Woman Warrior*, (Random House, 1989) students wanted to know more about Chinese superstitions. First we gathered questions. They wanted to know if the attitudes toward girls had changed in contemporary China. They wondered how the combination of science and magic worked in hospitals. We filled the board with possible research questions, all of them theirs. Next, students formed groups to determine research strategies, and then they stormed the library for answers. They also interviewed experts, for example, some of the students' Chinese grandmothers. A few days later, the groups reported their findings to the class. Some products took the form of charts, others skits, some papers. The nature of the findings dictated the form. Evaluating these reports made much better educational sense to me than checking the footnotes on a paper typed by a student's father's secretary. I believe my students came away from this assignment with a feel for what real research is all about—finding real answers to real questions.

I was also happy because we had eleven percent more class time for the serious business of reading and writing. In my classroom, the Termpapasaurus Rex is definitely extinct.

REAL RESEARCH FOR REAL READERS

by Mary G. Bernath
Bloomsburg University, Pennsylvania

For most students, the traditional research paper seems an artificial construct of education, an invented-for-school torture that is relevant in school but nowhere else. Students learn to do a research paper in English class so that they'll be "prepared" when they are asked to do one for another subject area in the future. Unfortunately, the paper often has no intrinsic worth in terms of genuine inquiry. The topic is often chosen for them, and the project is completed merely to bank a skill for future use. No wonder students resist; they consider the time they spend doing research in school to be only marginally relevant.

Research, however, does not end at graduation. All good jobs require research and researched writing; thus, research should become a lifetime priority. Yet, merely saying so will not convince students; they must see the relevance for themselves. They need to discover ways in which research enters their daily lives.

An Alternative Textbook

Standard how-to texts, beginning with the choosing and narrowing of a topic and ending with sample student papers on the subject currently in vogue (in 1980, nuclear power; in 1990, date rape), only reinforce the invented-for-school irrelevance of the research paper. If instead students scan the nonfiction shelves in bookstores and newsstands, they find research in abundance. Of these alternative textbook possibilities, the *New Yorker* magazine, which has been publishing quality nonfiction since 1925, seems to stand out.

Based on the principles that matter most to English teachers everywhere—devotion to detail, clarity of language, meticulous editing, and creativity—it is filled with one research paper after another.

For variety and quality, I know of no better choice, and, with its attractive student rate, the *New Yorker* is also the biggest bargain on today's market. The magazine's researched articles, though packaged somewhat differently from standard research papers, are identical with them in their underlying principles. The magazine is perfect for teaching how to synthesize material, how to use primary and secondary sources, and even how to document things correctly. Although the magazine format includes no footnotes or parenthetical notes, all sources are clearly acknowledged through textual clues. Week after week, as students read researched pieces in the magazine on diverse topics such as the fires in Yellowstone, the drug wars in Colombia, or the sexual life of elephants; they see that research is a way of life for writers, not something dreamed up for school. English teachers who adopt the magazine as a textbook will develop entirely new types of researched assignments to supplement or replace the traditional research paper.

I have developed a sequence of six two-to-four-page papers, each successive assignment a little more demanding of students in terms of research skills, synthesis of material, and documentation. Each project incorporates a strong sense of intended audience beyond the teacher, reinforcing the idea that researched writing has a purpose and is meant to be read.

New Yorker "Talk"

The sequence begins with an assignment based on "The Talk of the Town," a weekly collection of four informal 500–1000-word pieces that are among the best in the magazine. "The Talk of the Town" pieces are responses to the natural curiosity of writers and readers and answer questions such as, "What is a foley artist" (a person who does sound effects for commercials and movies), and "How many roses are there in New York City" (about 30,000, according to Stephen Scanniello, who is conducting a rose inventory in the city). Information is gathered by careful observation and by asking questions, techniques well within the ability of students.

A week before beginning the assignment, I send students around campus and through town in search of things that seem unusual or out of place—people, objects, behaviors. They begin to notice off-sized doors, puzzling names, strange phenomena. From these come a collection of fascinating pieces far too interesting to stop with me. Seeking a wider audience for their "Talk" pieces, I submit them, with bylines, to the student newspaper to use as the editors wish. (I suspect local newspapers would also welcome these submissions.) I send every one, even the weakest, to the paper, resisting the temptation to edit or judge, changing only the names or details necessary to protect the feelings or privacy of any individuals mentioned. Typically, about twenty percent are chosen for publication, usually my favorites but not always. Students are delighted with the public recognition of their writing, dismayed when editors change their pieces in ways they do not approve of.

The students' own classmates are another audience for these pieces. I duplicate the entire class set of "Talk" pieces, without bylines (as in the *New Yorker* style), and distribute them in class, where students divide into three-person editorial boards, each asked to choose a combination of three or four pieces they might include in an upcoming issue of the *Bloomsburger* magazine. I ask students to choose the pieces for quality and for their compatibility with each other as well. When students present their choices to the class, the combinations are varied, about half of the student pieces included in at least one, some in several. Through these two ventures, students get the positive and negative feedback associated with writing for publication. And through both, writing becomes meaningful, evoking pride and satisfaction.

The Interview

A planned interview moves student writers a step beyond the informal inquiry required for the "Talk" pieces. Again, the magazine provides ample models for the kinds of things students are asked to do. Virtually every "Talk of the Town" includes a piece tailor-made for teaching interview techniques. To illustrate the kinds of questions good interviewers ask, I often have students extract the implied questions from the finished pieces, based on the replies given and transitional devices. The magazine shows how to interweave quotation and paraphrase within an interview, how to insert an author's opinion, and how to incorporate physical details of person or setting. The planned interview works best with people that students know well—family members, coworkers, friends, and neighbors from home. Their audiences are the natural ones—the subjects themselves and the people who know them. Good topics for interview papers are jobs, dreams, comparisons of generations, oral histories of an event or time period, and family histories. Interview writing is demanding, requiring both initiative and organization from students, but it seldom seems irrelevant to students, since they are asking questions for which they genuinely want answers.

Fact Checking

After these forays into primary research, students' questioning can now be directed to the library. An assignment that works well is to ask students to assume the role of "Fact Checkers" for a single "impossible" question. Once again, the magazine prepares them for this inquiry, making the search more than just an empty exercise. "Check the Facts," one of the publications the *New Yorker* offers to teachers to enhance the magazine's use in class, features its research department, whose mission each week is to confirm every fact in every article, drawing, or cartoon before the issue goes to press. The magazine's compulsiveness in this regard has been legendary ever since its earliest days when Harold Ross was editor, and while the thoroughness seems a little extreme to most students, it holds a certain fascination for them. As a result, they take it in stride when I give them a fact of their own to check, lifted from the current semester's articles.

The "Impossible Search" project (with a different question for every student) focuses not so much on the answer as on the logic and thoroughness of their approach to finding it. Last semester's challenges included, "Confirm the 250-foot line (high water mark of ocean if/when Greenland and Antarctic ice melts)," and "Who is Dr. Caligari? Is his connection with plastic surgery a valid one?" This project coaxes students into unknown corners of the library, and, surprisingly, frustration is fairly rare, despite the fact that probably twenty percent of the answers are never found. Students narrate the path they took, naming every source they consulted, including the dead ends. The search is more fun than students expect it to be, and their taste of what the *New Yorker* research staff goes through for each fact in each issue gives them a new appreciation for these people and for library research in general. Each student is expected to report what was found to their classmates, who act as an interested audience for each other's discoveries, and to include a bibliography of sources consulted with their finished assignment.

Curiosity Reading

These assignments take advantage of students' natural curiosity. Students want to know about the oddities on campus, about the experiences and goals of people they know, and whether a strange fact they read is true. And, because they are excited about what they found, they want to share that information with others.

In addition, they are ready to enter into new areas of inquiry. The magazine exposes students to areas they have little knowledge of or interest in when they begin—politics, world affairs, modern fiction, and the arts—whetting their appetites to learn more. Their interest develops best if students are allowed to choose for themselves what to read. I generally require them to keep a reading journal with two entries a week, one on a "Talk of the Town" piece and one on anything else that interests them. At first they search for the familiar, articles about sports or movies or perhaps a short story, but soon they discover that even these familiar subjects are treated differently than they expected. It is not long until they are dabbling in politics, jazz, and even poetry. Students become readers by choice and read what appeals to them. Often these articles touch subjects students would never encounter under ordinary circumstances. Many articles are highly opinionated, such as an Elizabeth Drew "Letter from Washington" or a Pauline Kael review of a movie performance, and students find themselves reacting to the ideas presented. Before long, they begin to ask serious questions and to form opinions of their own. Many are surprised to discover that their favorite articles are often the longest ones (a common size is thirty to forty pages for the magazine's major piece each week), and they will read every word, even though they are told they need not finish more than the first five pages.

Documented Research

Having begun to think about new ideas and kinds of research, students are capable of a larger project, one that requires multiple sources and synthesis of material. Selecting a long researched piece in the magazine, I have students list every likely source used: library material, interviews, clippings, on-site visits, recordings, pamphlets, whatever. The lists are always surprisingly long and very detailed. Next I choose a segment, two to three paragraphs long, and ask students to distinguish among quotation, paraphrase, and author commentary, justifying each particular use.

The fact that no formal notes appear in *New Yorker* articles is actually a plus in teaching documentation. The articles are excellent illustrations of the use of lead-in phrases and other devices. After students locate these in a particular piece, I ask them to mark where the parenthetical notes would actually have to be inserted, should this article be rewritten for a publication requiring formal documentation.

Research assignments grow directly out of the magazine. Students might begin with a "Notes and Comment" editorial or some other article that interests them. Then, using the article as their first source, they might investigate in depth the implications or particulars of the subject. Another research project is to have students investigate an event, preferably a small and manageable one, and find out what really happened. Conflicts of various kinds—crimes, accidents, scandals, disasters, or confrontations between groups or individuals—work well, because when people are under stress, accounts of what happened tend to get distorted. The focus might have to be limited to part of an event to allow for sufficient sifting through information in order to reach valid conclusions. Again, curiosity is the key. Students must want to know.

These steps, taken together, teach students more about the techniques of research writing than they would learn through the equivalent instructions and sample term paper that are generally found in a textbook. And these steps result in far more than the encyclopedia patchworks students have produced in the past. Students are more willing to begin their own searches after having been exposed to research with life in it—fresh topics, fresh approaches to old topics, limitless topics.

Literary Analysis

Opportunities for original discoveries increase even more in the field of literary analysis. Students are afraid to trust their own readings of stories and poems, a result of being conditioned to believe that English teachers and literary critics have the monopoly on "correct" interpretations. *New Yorker* fiction, however, forces everyone to read and try to make sense of it for oneself. The challenge is unavoidable because the stories and poems, having been so recently published, have not as yet been interpreted. When I ask students to choose a favorite story and write an explication for someone who has read it once but is still uncertain about what it means exactly, the assignment makes perfect sense to them.

I prepare them for this project by exploring a story of my choice in class, working through all the kinds of thinking and close textual analysis they will need to do to write their own explication and appreciation of a different story. The assignment, as I define it, has three parts: identification and background (type of story, information on the author, etc.), basics of the story (character, plot, point of view, structure), and detailed analysis of the one aspect of the story they found most puzzling, interesting, or significant (a single image, the opening sentence, a character's motivation, the ending). Supplemental research—biographical information on the author and/or reading other stories the author has published is encouraged to provide a context. Sometimes, students find even this small bit of help is unavailable, for this may be the author's first published story. Most often, they are left with only themselves to rely on. They know that I, too, may need their help in understanding the story, since it is new to all of us.

Students find this assignment challenging, but the results are often outstanding, once students accept the validity of their own repeated readings, far better than when asked to interpret one of the classics. If possible, it is worth devoting class time to having students get together with others who have chosen the same story in order to compare their final interpretations, learning and gaining confidence from each other's insights.

A Final Exam

Another possibility for using multiple sources is to have students write a thesis paper based entirely in the magazine. I use this project as a final exam, but it could work just as well as a standard four-page paper. First, I ask students to prepare a bibliography of all the articles that have pertained to a particular subject of their choice over the duration of their subscription. We can generally locate at least a half dozen promising topics each semester. The topics are, of course, totally dependent on the articles that appear in the magazine. Some that have worked well were the Bush Presidency, success in business, the health of Planet Earth, California life, Russia today, and modern art. It is quite possible to generate a bibliography of eight to twelve promising sources on these subjects. After rereading these myself, I devise for each topic an opinion question that can be developed using the information in the articles. For an exam, I keep the question a surprise until the last minute, making the answer a prepared but impromptu essay, with open magazines and notebooks permitted. Students are expected to support all their opinions with paraphrase and quotations from the articles themselves and to document their

sources with parenthetical notes (at least five) and a bibliography (of three articles or more). The exam is demanding but not difficult, and the results convince me that the students have indeed mastered what they need to know about research writing. If done as an at-home paper rather than an exam, even more thought and care could go into the project. Students could devise their own thesis questions and plan their use of sources much more carefully. From a teacher's standpoint, the project succeeds in eliminating two of the biggest headaches associated with the traditional research paper—plagiarism and unavailability of sources. Since the instructor is familiar with every possible source and can check references as much as desired, plagiarism is virtually impossible, and since students already own all the sources they need, the frustrations of stolen articles and overtaxed library holdings can be avoided entirely. Although this project does not teach library skills, it does allow for ample practice in all other aspects of writing from sources.

Conclusion

Clearly, using a magazine such as the *New Yorker* as a guide to research writing increases considerably the options available to students and teachers. The magazine releases research from its constricting identification with card catalogs, notecards, footnotes, and bibliographies and allows students to see what research is really about. They begin finally to understand its purpose, its usefulness, and even some of its excitement. The sheer bulk of quality research writing, a thousand pages or more over the sixteen weeks, sends an undeniable message that this kind of writing is a mainstream activity. Research writing, students discover, is not boring writing unless we make it so. Students begin to see that good research writing is always in process, each piece relating not only to the ones that preceded it but also to those that will follow. Even *New Yorker* articles, polished and checked though they are, are open to further exploration. One person's answers give rise to another person's questions, as students themselves discover every time they use the magazine as a starting point for their own research. They come to realize, too, that their discoveries are important and that research writing is meaningless without an audience of interested learners. They take pride in their discoveries and interest in the work of their peers. Students learn that research is time-consuming, hard work, but they begin to agree that if professionals, such as the magazine's writers and editorial staff, are willing to invest so much effort to get the facts right and the ideas as clear as possible, it must be worth the trouble.

After a semester of reading, writing, and researching in this broader context, students realize that the research paper is both less and more than they originally thought. Having become so familiar with this kind of writing, they are less likely to approach it with fear and dread in the future. But having encountered it so frequently, they will know, too, that they are likely to see it—and do it—again and again. Now that they know research for what it is, they know that it will be a permanent part of their future—not just in school but wherever they go.

THE TWO-SOURCE SYNTHESIS: THE HEART OF A RESEARCH PAPER

by Dan Donlan
University of California, Riverside

Having taught high school juniors and seniors for a dozen years, I have come into repeated contact with the dreaded, but required, term paper. In my early years as a teacher, my students turned in term papers that were either scrapbooks or faithful reproductions of encyclopedias. As time moved on, I tried to make effective use of style manuals and even tried exercises in thesis development, but to little avail. The disappointing results were always difficult for students to produce and were expensive, consuming six weeks of instruction. It was not until I began working in preservice and inservice education that I stumbled across a relatively easy, inexpensive way to teach research writing: the two-source synthesis. If students can compose an effective two-source synthesis, they have mastered the basis of research writing—the heart of a research paper.

In order for students to write a two-source synthesis, they must be able to do two things: SQ3R and paraphrasing. Most basic reading instruction includes lessons on the SQ3R method—*S*urvey the reading, ask *Q*uestions, *R*ead to find the answers to those questions, *R*ecite, or describe to someone else what has been read, and *R*econstruct, or summarize what has been read. Paraphrasing techniques can be taught as part of recitation and reconstruction, or it can be taught separately in a series of short exercises showing students how to rephrase single words and phrases, sentences, and, eventually, whole paragraphs.

One way to introduce the students to the two-source synthesis is to control the sources, that is, have all the students use the same two sources of information on a given topic at the same time. My favorite two sources to duplicate are a pair of short (100–150 word) passages concerning the Aztec Indians.

The Instructional Sequence

I ask the students to read the first brief article on Aztec Indians. I suggest that the students read the article a second time and even a third time.

I then ask the students to remove the article from their desk and summarize the article from memory. I caution them not to look at the original article.

Next, I ask the students to read a second article on Aztec Indians. As I did the first time, I tell them to read the article several times and then remove it from their desk. I then ask the students to summarize this second article from memory without looking at it.

At this point, each student has two summaries of two different articles on the same subject. I resume the instructional sequence by asking the students to look at their summaries of the two articles read on Aztec Indians, cross out any information on the second summary that appears on the first summary, and number each of the sentences that are left on the second summary, in order to be able to identify them later by number.

I then ask the students to show where they might fit the sentences of their second summary between sentences of their first summary, using the identifying number of each sentence, so that the two summaries together make good sense.

Finally, I ask the students to write a final draft of the summary, now rewriting the two summaries as one.

An alternative approach to the last part of the sequence might be to ask the students to read the two summaries they have written several times each, and afterwards, to put the two summaries under the desk, next to the original two articles they read. I might then ask the students to retell the story of the Aztecs, drawing upon their memory of the two summaries they just read.

I find it useful to repeat this process several times with other controlled pairs of sources until the students have developed facility with the two-source synthesis. Next, I direct the students to locate two sources on the same topic in the library and ask them to repeat the process of two-source synthesis.

Once the students have mastered the two-source synthesis, they can embark on longer and more complicated syntheses—three to five sources, ten to fifteen sources, twenty to thirty sources. By engaging in synthesis, the students learn that learning comes with putting information into their own words, not from copying, and that integrating sources of information can produce an increased understanding of any topic or issue.

THE RESEARCH PAPER REDUX

by Henry Kiernan
Southern Regional High School
Manahawkin, New Jersey

We live in the Information Age, we are told, a brave new world whose language is transformed by networking, retrieval systems, and data bases. Amid a landscape of technological hardware and software, we can guarantee information delivery overnight, and we can provide immediate access to the information, if we fax it over fiber optic transmission lines or bounce it off satellite dishes. In preparing students for the Information Age, teaching the research process takes on a critical role, empowering students to meet this challenge.

Unfortunately, the typical research process undertaken in most high schools is a thesis-driven paper, using primary sources, reacting to a list of teacher-suggested topics.

If students somehow survive the bibliography card shuffle, they learn to apply a minimum number of citations, usually written as footnotes, unless their teachers in their own recent undergraduate courses experienced writing within-text citation styles, such as revised-MLA or APA. Their teachers are left finally to deal with the issue of plagiarism, addressing an audience weaned on Cliffs Notes.

Why then teach the research paper? Certainly, the thesis-driven, primary source, footnote-bound experience deserves to be seriously questioned. However, a research paper that is question-driven, drawn from student-generated questions, utilizing primary and secondary sources, is an empowering model designed to enable students to set the agenda and to make choices. When investigating a question rather than demonstrating a proof, students learn that they have not only the right to speak but also the validity to express their views to an audience of peers and adults. Through the processes of analyzing and synthesizing information gathered to answer their own questions, students become advocates capable of persuading others to adopt their solutions to a problem.

The following recommendations are provided as suggested methods to transform the current thesis-driven model into a viable question-driven design. As guidelines, they are applicable to the changing needs of the Information Age.

1. Teach students to develop and frame questions for research investigation. First, teachers need to be trained to employ strategies for generating student questions. Use double-entry notebooks, journals, and literature logs to enkindle ideas derived from readings and discussion. Prereading and predrafting activities are most suitable for students to gain experience in framing questions for further study.
2. Whenever possible, make the research paper an inter-disciplinary project. For example, all of our sophomores develop their questions focusing on environmental issues. Whether their questions are bound by international, national, state, or community problems, the students share in a special school community issue which transcends the English classroom and connects it with social studies, science, and other curricular areas.
3. Design research experiences where students can conduct investigations in small teams. Who says the research paper is an individual student project? Behind every great leader, inventor, or scientist is a team of researchers who learn from each other through the processes of testing hypotheses and/or replication. With any research topic, working with peers collaboratively will enhance learning and advocacy. Local history projects and community and state issues serve as affordable vehicles for team research.
4. Beyond primary sources, let students conduct interviews, surveys, archaeological digs, and questionnaires. Even in the Information Age, the best solution to student questions may not be found in data bases or literature searches.
5. If the topic is to be literature-based, let students choose a novel. While reading, students construct questions to research. For example, a student reads *The Great Gatsby* and wants to question the validity of the values Fitzgerald presents in his characters. Perhaps the student may wish to question what his own hometown was like during the 1920s. The literature thus serves as the prompt to assist students with personalizing questions for a formal research paper. A piece of historical fiction works especially well to engender an interdisciplinary focus.
6. Encourage students to write letters to obtain information from a variety of sources including government officials, businesses, international organizations, college professors and school teachers. Students will also need to learn how to evaluate and synthesize this information.
7. When the papers are finished, develop a forum where student work can be shared and discussed. When applicable, this forum can go beyond the realm of the school and community when students present letters, including an abstract of their paper, to local and state representatives advocating adoption of their research findings.
8. Publish the best papers to serve as models for students. We all need examples to emulate and benchmarks to encourage and to question.

Students, indeed teachers and administrators as well, need enabling skills and the right to take risks before they can ever reach a true measure of empowerment. Question-driven research is one strategy that empowers a student through the active processes of writing and thinking for oneself.

Question-driven research guarantees a gradual sense of self-responsiblity and a genuine testing of ideas. Utilizing the research skills of inquiry and advocacy, students will be better prepared to participate in the challenges of the Information Age.

CALLS FOR MANUSCRIPTS— PLANS FOR FUTURE ISSUES

The *CSSEDC Quarterly*, a publication of the Conference for Secondary School English Department Chairpersons of NCTE, seeks articles of 250-3,000 words on topics of interest to English department leaders. Informal, firsthand accounts of successful department activities are encouraged.

Recent surveys of our readers reveal these topics of interest: leadership training for the new department chair, class size/class load, support from the business community, at-risk student programs, problems for rural schools, reading/writing centers, and

whole language curriculum. Short articles on these and other concerns are published in every issue. In addition, upcoming issues will have these themes:

October 1990 (July 1 deadline):
Supervision/Observation/Evaluation

December 1990 (September 15 deadline):
Effective Leadership

February 1991 (November 1 deadline):
Whole Language in the High School

May 1991 (February 1 deadline):
The Learning Labels: At-risk; LD; Dyslexia; Remedial

Manuscripts may be sent on 5.25- or 3.5-inch floppy disks, with IBM compatible ASCII files or as traditional double-spaced, typed copy.

Address articles and inquiries to: James Strickland, editor, *CSSEDC Quarterly*, English Department, Slippery Rock University of Pennsylvania, 16057-1326.

JANE CHRISTENSEN HONORED WITH NEW AWARD FROM NCTE COMMITTEE

Jane Christensen, deputy executive director of the National Council of Teachers of English, has received the first Rewey Belle Inglis Award, given by the NCTE Committee on Women in the Profession. The award, named in honor of NCTE's first woman president who served in 1928–29, recognizes women for achievement in scholarship (research and writing), teaching, and/or service.

Before joining the NCTE staff in 1981, Christensen taught English at the college, high school, and junior high school levels. She served as consultant for the Educational Testing Service, the College Board, the Library of Congress, and Centers for the Study of Writing and Literature, among others. Her work in national and legislative relations and fund-raising have resulted in NCTE programs that honor students and teachers. Among her publications are short stories, poetry, and theological essays as well as numerous textbooks in language, composition, and literature.

The NCTE Committee on Women in the Profession is accepting nominations for the 1990 Inglis Award. Council members may recommend candidates who have been NCTE members for five or more years. Send nominee's name, vita material, and a letter of support before June 1 to Jeanne Gerlach, Chair, NCTE Committee on Women in the Profession, West Virginia University, Division of Human Resources and Education, 604-0 Allen Hall, Morgantown, West Virginia 26506-6122.

The National Council of Teachers of English is a nonprofit professional organization made up of 130,000 individual members and subscribers. Its aim is to improve the teaching of English and the language arts at all levels of education. The NCTE Committee on Women in the Profession focuses attention on the status of women in the Council and in the profession and recommends ways of ensuring equitable treatment of women.

CSSEDC Executive Committee

Chair
Wendell Schwartz
Stevenson High School
16070 West Highway 22
Prairie View, Illinois 60069

Associate Chair
Myles Eley
Warren Central High School
9500 East 16th Street
Indianapolis, Indiana 46229

Past Chair
Emil J. Sanzari
Paramus High School
East Century Road
Paramus, New Jersey 07652

Liaison to NCTE Secondary Section Committee
Carol Compton
Hudson High School
Hudson, Massachusetts 01749

Corresponding Secretary
Susan Hayles-Berbower
Huntington Beach UHSD
10251 Yorktown Avenue
Huntington Beach, CA 92646

Membership Chair
Thomas Jones
Wyoming Valley West High School
Wadham Street
Plymouth, Pennsylvania 18651

Secretary-Treasurer
Miles Myers
NCTE

Staff Liaison
L. Jane Christensen
NCTE

Members-at-Large
Susan Benjamin
Highland Park High School
433 Vine
Highland Park, Illinois 60035

Thomas Fischer
Lyons Township High School
100 S. Brainard Avenue
La Grange, Illinois 60525

Ira Hayes
Syosset High School
South Woods Road
Syosset, New York 11791

Judith M. Kelly
Hine Junior High School
8th and Pennsylvania Avenue, SE
Washington, DC 20003

Deborah Smith McCullar
Dean Morgan Junior High School
1440 S. Elm
Casper, Wyoming 82601

Kevin C. McHugh
Finneytown Jr./Sr. High School
8916 Fountainebleau Terrace
Cincinnati, Ohio 45231

CSSEDC QUARTERLY
National Council of Teachers of English
1111 Kenyon Road
Urbana, Illinois 61801

Nonprofit
Organization
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
Champaign, Illinois
Permit No. 85

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CSSEDC Quarterly

Conference for Secondary School English Department Chairpersons

Volume 12, Number 3
October 1990
Editor: James Strickland

In This Issue

SUPERVISION AND EVALUATION

by James Strickland, editor

Researcher Donald Graves has a question that he likes to ask, just to be difficult: "What's it for?" I decided it's a fair question to ask about the responsibility that department chairs have to supervise and evaluate their own department members. What's it for? The cynical answer is that the purpose is to do the management's job, monitoring the compliance and behavior of employees, testing that their work is up to standards, and weeding out the incompetent, or more often, the unconventional. A better answer, given by the authors of the articles featured in this issue, is that the purpose of supervision and evaluation is to promote better education. It is a task given to those who are able to guide those new to the profession and to redirect those who have been teaching for a lifetime. It is mentoring, with a stick, if you will. After developing a special program to work with first-year teachers, Jane Zaharias and Kathleen Benghiat, of Cleveland State University, suggest ways for department chairs to nurture the neophytes, offering directions for grooming them to become second-year teachers. Carol Jago, of Santa Monica High School in California, provides a practical technique for handling the supervisory duties that department chairs are obligated to perform. She suggests using the journal, a double-entry journal for classroom observations, one column for observation, the other for evaluation.

Susan Benjamin, of Highland Park High School, and Janice Jordan, of Deerfield High School, Illinois, describe the progressive model of supervision and evaluation employed in their school district, District 113. The model moves from clinical supervision to collegial supervision and culminates in self-directed supervision. Betty C. Sisco, the chairperson of the English department at Center Grove High School, Greenwood, Indiana, finds that supervision really entails recognition, revealing that those recognized desire to do more and do it better when they feel affirmed by positive acknowledgment. Paul C. Bellin, the humanities coordinator of the Weld County School District, in Greeley, Colorado, is the Program Chair of the 1990 CSSEDC Convention, to be held in Atlanta, Georgia. In his article, "Leading with Imagination," he gives a preview of the speakers and topics that will highlight this year's conference.

Finally, Wendy Paterson, the director of the Basic Skills Computer Lab for the Academic Skills Center at Buffalo State College, begins the first in a series of Software Review columns. For this issue she reviews *Norton Textra Writer 2.0 with Online Handbook*, published by W. W. Norton and Company.

Inside . . . **page number**

To Be, Or Not To Be, a Second-Year Teacher 2
by Jane A. Zaharias and Kathleen T. Benghiat

A Journal for Classroom Observations 5
by Carol Jago

From Clinical to Collegial to Self-Directed:
A Progressive Model of Supervision and Evaluation . . 6
by Susan Benjamin and Janice Jordan

Supervision Means Recognition 7
by Betty C. Sisco

Leading with Imagination 8
by Paul C. Bellin

***Norton Textra Writer 2.0 with Online Handbook* 8**
by Wendy Paterson

Calls for Manuscripts 9

CSSEDC Election Slate 1990 9

The Ballot 12

It is the policy of NCTE in its journals and other publications to provide a forum for the open discussion of ideas concerning the content and the teaching of English and the language arts. Publicity accorded to any particular point of view does not imply endorsement by the Executive Committee, the Board of Directors, or the membership at large, except in announcements of policy where such endorsement is clearly specified. Copyright for articles published in *CSSEDC Quarterly* reverts to the respective authors.

CSSEDC Quarterly (ISSN 0738-1409) is published in October, December, February, and May by the National Council of Teachers of English, 1111 Kenyon Road, Urbana, Illinois 61801. Subscription price for the Conference for Secondary School English Department Chairpersons, $10.00 per year. Add $2.00 per year for Canadian and all other international postage. Single copy, $2.50 ($1.50 members). Remittances should be made payable to NCTE by check, money order, or bank draft in U.S. currency. Communications regarding change of address and permission to reprint should be addressed to the National Council of Teachers of English, 1111 Kenyon Road, Urbana, Illinois 61801.

TO BE, OR NOT TO BE, A SECOND-YEAR TEACHER

by Jane A. Zaharias and Kathleen T. Benghiat
Cleveland State University

Starting a teaching career challenges an individual on many fronts; but a challenge is also issued to the profession, especially to the department chairperson charged with the supervision, observation, and evaluation of beginning teachers at a time when their careers most need sustenance. Recognizing that the first year of teaching is often traumatic, our article reports the most common problems faced by new English teachers and suggests ways in which department chairpersons might assist the neophyte.

Written accounts by eight secondary English teachers of their initial year in the classroom were analyzed to reveal their five most prevalent concerns: loss of control, professional isolationism, communication breakdowns, time management, and inadequate feedback. Excerpts from these written accounts contained within this article function as a series of soliloquies, forcing those of us who might be considered seasoned veterans to recall much of the doubt, hesitation, alienation, and even self-recrimination that characterize the first year of teaching, those feelings that make this stage of professional development so tenuous.

Loss of Control

Classroom management was the most frequently cited of the problems reported by the beginning teachers we studied. For many, the maintenance of order and discipline remained a constant source of frustration throughout the school year. As evident in the following statement made by a junior high school teacher during her first month on the job, effective methods for dealing with inappropriate student behavior were not easily recalled or implemented when needed.

"My biggest problem thus far has been all of the talking students do. It's driving me crazy. It seems that every second they don't have something to work on, they talk. Sometimes they even talk quietly while I'm teaching. I do have a system for classroom management, and my students are aware of it. Even so, the talking persists, especially during the last five minutes of class time usually allocated to homework assignments. Sometimes I feel as though I have no control, and it worries me."

The word "control" repeatedly surfaced in these teachers' accounts of their experiences. Feelings of failure, synonymous in the minds of many with a loss of control, grew in direct proportion to reported increases in student misconduct. When stopgap disciplinary measures proved ineffectual, these feelings were often accompanied by an expression of insecurity and self-doubt. Many first-year teachers wondered what they would do if students remained unresponsive or publicly challenged their authority: "What happens if the problem occurs again? I will follow through and call parents; but if that doesn't work, what then?"

The concern shared by first-year teachers, that immediate answers are not easily obtained to questions such as these, is the result in part of the professional isolationism which characterizes teaching, the second most prevalent concern.

Professional Isolationism

Not surprisingly, the new teachers we surveyed found it difficult to establish and maintain professional relationships with colleagues. Within the course of a typical school day, opportunities for collegial discussions are rare. Even when they exist, new teachers are sometimes reluctant to ask for help, fearing that their requests will be perceived as a sign of incompetence. While most first-year teachers eventually gained the acceptance of peers, the friendship and approval they initially sought as newcomers to an ongoing social and professional community were slowly-won victories. Not until the end of April, for example, did one teacher write:

"I've been concentrating on establishing good working relationships with my colleagues. As a first-year teacher, I was often unsure of what to say and how to act around other members of the faculty. Eventually, I began to discover who the gossips are and who I could trust. I'm feeling much more comfortable now than I was at the beginning of the year. This has taken much longer than I expected; but, that 'new-kid-on-the-block' feeling is finally beginning to disappear!"

In instances where self-initiated attempts at collaboration proved unsuccessful, however, feelings of nonacceptance and alienation tended to intensify.

"People could be more helpful if only they would voluntarily share successful lesson plans and materials they have prepared. While I have frequently loaned things to another English teacher, this person didn't seem the least bit interested in helping me." Perhaps even more problematic than gaining the respect of fellow faculty members, their ability to establish constructive relationships with parents genuinely concerned all eight teachers. First-year teachers felt considerable anxiety when faced with the responsibility of conducting parent-teacher conferences, because they lacked both strategies for involving parents in the education of their children, as well as previous experience in reporting pupil progress. Overbearing parents were of particular concern. One first-year teacher asked:

"What do you do about pushy parents? Recently, I have encountered several of them. In one instance, the parent was an English professor and thought that her daughter should be in the honors program. The girl was very bright, but she did not qualify for placement in honors English based on her test scores. This mother just would not accept this fact and contacted everyone imaginable to get her daughter's placement changed. In another instance, a mother came to see me to find out what her daughter needed to do to become a cheerleader. As I listened to her, I had to wonder who wanted to be a cheerleader the most, the mother or the daughter."

Communication Breakdowns

The daily tasks of a beginning teacher are made more aggravating and complicated than necessary by a lack of communication. The most frequent complaint registered in this area had to do with the completion of routine forms. Paperwork often seems insurmountable, but when it comes without direction, it is impossible. In addition, many of the first-year teachers we studied expressed dissatisfaction when administrators failed to forewarn them of changes in the daily schedule. Although problems such as these are relatively minor, mixed messages and negligence on the part of administrators can have dire consequences. Take, for example, the account of an English teacher who elected to leave the profession after completing her first year of teaching:

"My department head kept giving me information and telling me what he expected after the fact. For instance, he didn't give me a copy of the curriculum guide until late October; yet, he held me accountable for not having taught what was in that guide. I felt I was expected to perform as well as someone who had been teaching for ten or twenty years. I also felt I was not permitted to make any decisions about the way I taught my classes. I was very uncomfortable discussing these problems with my department chairperson; I was also uncomfortable sharing my concerns with other members of the faculty."

The preceding anecdote indicates an ongoing problem in communication between the department chairperson and the first-year teacher. Were a greater effort made to improve communication within schools, the demonstrated need of first-year teachers to establish and maintain positive interpersonal relationships might more readily be met, resulting in increased job satisfaction and enhanced performance.

Time Management

Time management proved another serious concern for the eight teachers studied. The first-year teacher seemed unprepared for the relentless pace of a secondary teacher's life, having initially anticipated that sufficient time would be provided for class preparation. Most of the teachers expressed concern when it became evident that their assumption was erroneous. One high school teacher confided: "I'm always worried about being properly prepared for class. Usually, I am prepared; however, more often than not, it's a rush job. As I struggle just to keep ahead of my students, I've become increasingly insecure." Pressed to prove themselves professionally, many indicated that their personal lives were suffering. One middle school teacher reported:

"My biggest time management problem is one of finding a balance between my personal life and work. I have so many ideas—so much I want to accomplish with my classes this year. I become frustrated when I realize I simply can't get it all done. Meanwhile, as I scheme and grade papers, the dishes in the sink change shape as the remnants of past meals harden on them, the pile of dirty laundry in the hamper grows higher, library books I intended to read sit dust covered and overdue on the shelf, and my poor husband voices feelings of neglect. How do others manage?"

The simple fact is, some barely do. Overwhelmed by the demands of their new careers, exhaustion frequently leads to depression, depression to discontent and resentment. In April of her first year teaching, one individual summed it up:

"I'm always tired and depressed. In fact, I can barely drag myself out of bed in the morning. I dread going to school, and the students are really getting on my nerves. Testing, report cards, detention, bulletin boards, parent conferences—it's just too much." While difficulties related to time management may persist throughout a teacher's career, rarely are they more acutely felt than during the first year of teaching.

Inadequate Feedback

In order to improve, first-year teachers depend upon detailed feedback on their job performance from experienced professionals such as their department chairs. Performance standards, if ambiguous, often serve to exacerbate problems rather than guide improvement by placing the novice at a decided disadvantage when attempting to set priorities and balance divergent demands. In situations where independent practice is not closely monitored, it is unlikely that beginners will realize their potential as reflective practitioners, capable of adapting instructional procedures to meet contextual demands. Criticism and comments that fail to encourage novices to analyze their own teaching behaviors and institute plans for self-improvement contribute to feelings of abandonment and helplessness. When offered without chance for rebuttal or discussion, even satisfactory evaluations can be disturbing.

"I was finally observed by my department chair two weeks ago [mid-January]. When I had my conference with him, he kept stating, 'You are doing very well, for a first-year teacher.' The second part of this comment really bothers me. I used a very traditional approach the day he observed. Consequently, he suggested I try some different techniques. I'm concerned that he thinks I always use the same methods when, in fact, I really don't. Because the conference was rushed, I didn't have a chance to explain. Now, it seems too late."

Almost as intolerable as the inadequate supervisory practices outlined above is the habit some administrators make of casually "dropping in" for brief classroom visits, especially when they fail to make clear their intended purpose. Consider, for example, the ramifications of one principal's attempt at increased visibility if viewed from the perspective of a beginning teacher: "My principal keeps coming in my room. While I'm not bothered by his presence, I am bothered by the fact that he always leaves without saying anything."

While there is little doubt that consultation with supervisory personnel can contribute to the novice's continued professional development, the realization of this goal depends heavily on the nature, quality, and quantity of feedback received subsequent to classroom observation. More specifically, descriptive feedback aimed at improving instruction needs to be given emphasis over summative measures of performance. During postobservational conferences, new teachers might also benefit from further assistance in the interpretation and use of feedback derived from student evaluations of teaching, measures of student learning, self-appraisal checklists, and videotaped segments of classroom interactions. Supervisors such as department chairpersons and principals need to be reminded that preconferencing can serve to greatly reduce much of the needless anxiety newcomers experience during classroom observations when they have been reassured as to the purpose of a visit and the observational procedures to be employed. During this phase of supervision, attention might also be given to refinement of a first-year teacher's planning skills.

Suggestions to Help the First-Year Teacher

The key figure in the successful induction of any new English teacher will be the department chairperson who is charged with the responsibility for providing effective leadership. Robert Protherough, Judith Atkinson, and John Fawcett advise department chairs that "repeated comments testify to the importance of a person [who] can strike the right balance between professional tutor and critical friend, giving support without undue interference" (*The Effective Teaching of English*, London: Longman, 1989, p. 182).

Given that the single most important quality of any leader is the capacity to infuse vision and purpose into an organization, we can think of no more valuable goal than the cultivation and nourishment of new talent. Consequently, we encourage all English department chairpersons to consider ways in which they might personally assist first-year teachers and to rally senior faculty and other administrators in support of this cause.

Listed below are several practical strategies which, if implemented, can help alleviate many of the problems commonly faced by first-year teachers.

1. Exert your power and influence as a department chairperson to ensure an equitable assignment of courses. Whenever possible, careful consideration should be given the newcomer's strengths and educational background when making initial teaching assignments. As a matter of policy, first-year teachers should be spared notoriously difficult classes or unwanted courses.
2. First-year teachers should be exempt from extraneous duties and extracurricular advising assignments. Instead of cafeteria

supervision, for instance, suggest that the new teacher be granted an additional planning period or be teamed with a senior faculty member to teach an especially demanding class. In addition to providing for intellectual companionship, opportunities for collaboration often lead to improved classroom practice, as junior and senior faculty jointly explore the nature of good teaching. In making team teaching assignments, however, caution should be exercised to ensure that the neophyte and veteran have compatible teaching styles, that they share a common planning period, and that the senior member of the team is willing to assume responsibility for helping the beginner.

3. Make an effort to meet all new teachers in your department before the school year begins. If possible, arrange a departmental luncheon, picnic, or similar social event to welcome aboard new members.
4. To provide as much preparation time as possible, insist that newly hired teachers be furnished a copy of their course schedule and issued relevant textbooks and curriculum guides well before the school year begins. In addition, alert new teachers to the availability and location of supplementary instructional materials.
5. Make sure that all new teachers have been supplied a copy of the student handbook or similar materials in which pupils' rights and responsibilities are outlined.
6. Maintain a high profile of visibility during the first few days of school. You and other members of your department should make a practice of frequently dropping by the new teacher's classroom to answer immediate questions and offer necessary assistance.
7. Take advantage of the power of positive reinforcement. Send a personal, handwritten note to the beginning teacher during the first week of school in which you take note of and compliment an accomplishment.
8. Once the school year is under way, arrange a series of brief meetings to review administrative procedures with which the inexperienced teacher might not be familiar (e.g., issuing textbooks, making referrals, planning for the substitute, requesting audiovisual equipment, arranging for field trips, and placing work orders).
9. Begin a clipping file of articles on topics of possible concern to the first-year teacher (e.g., classroom management, time management, test construction, parent conferencing, record keeping). When appropriate, share these articles with the new teacher and arrange a convenient time for informal discussion.
10. Allocate time at department meetings to discuss topics of special concern. For example, prior to open house, schedule a department meeting to share conferencing techniques. Some provocative items for consideration might be: What questions can I anticipate parents will ask? What materials should I have on hand to share with parents? What information should I solicit? What can I learn from parent conferences? What are some common pitfalls to avoid? How should I handle questions I can't answer? How should I document parent contacts? What are some effective strategies for dealing with reticent parents, overbearing parents, angry parents, parents who never attended scheduled meetings or open house?
11. Make available NCTE, IRA, and ALA parent brochures for distribution during parent-teacher conferences and open house. Encourage faculty to prepare their own parent brochures on pertinent topics (e.g., "How Can I Help My Teenager Prepare for College Entrance Examinations?").
12. Collect and disseminate illustrative comments for inclusion on deficiency notices and report cards. Most beginning teachers lack sufficient experience in calculating and reporting quarterly grades. As a result, you should review grading policies and procedures with them before report cards are due.
13. Discuss with new teachers the relationships that exist between effective time management and instructional planning (e.g., staggering the due dates of major projects across classes to prevent needless backlogs in paper grading). Also, share proven strategies for reducing some of the paper load typically associated with teaching composition (e.g., portfolio grading, primary trait scoring, holistic scoring, and peer editing).
14. Encourage your colleagues to invite new teachers to visit their classrooms and ask that they share materials and ideas with beginners.
15. Early in the school year, review with new teachers the criteria your system employs for performance evaluation. At this point, you might want to share and explain any standardized forms used for reporting classroom observations and rendering composite evaluations.
16. Beginning in October, arrange to observe new teachers on a monthly basis, making sure to provide adequate time for pre- and postobservational conferencing.
17. Suggest that beginners maintain an up-to-date dossier containing data in support of their effectiveness as classroom teachers. Included in the dossier should be special course materials they have designed (e.g., reading lists, study guides, learning activity packets), copies of graded examinations, exemplary student projects, examples of feedback given on students' written work, grade distributions, student evaluations of teaching performance, self-appraisal checklists, plans for self-improvement, and examples of changes made in instructional delivery and/or teaching materials to accommodate for individual differences among learners. As a formative measure, the dossier provides a more complete picture of the newcomer's performance than can be obtained solely through observation. If periodically reviewed, it serves as an invitation to discuss concerns pivotal to the new teacher's success and can be used to identify potential areas for further development. As a summative device, the dossier helps ensure a balanced review of the first-year teacher's accomplishments and shortcomings.
18. Invite new teachers to attend professional and social events; encourage and sponsor their membership in those national, regional, and local associations to which you belong.
19. Where available, recommend that new teachers enroll in induction programs offered by local colleges and encourage their participation in special programs being offered by your school district for first-year teachers.

Conclusion

The quality of any school is linked to the quality of its faculty. We can attribute the success of any educational endeavor to their efforts. If schools and departments wish to claim excellence, they must be prepared to assist new teachers as they "suffer the slings and arrows of outrageous fortune." To ignore their unique needs, as has too often been done in the past, is to risk the loss of their services. Supportive departments, headed by conscientious chairs,

can mean the difference between the first-year teacher who is merely exhausted at the end of the school year and the one who is suicidal; the difference between the promising neophyte who chooses to stay in the profession and the one who elects to leave. In light of projected teacher shortages and the low status presently accorded members of the profession, this moment seems a particularly auspicious time to take action to help the first-year teacher become a second-year teacher.

A JOURNAL FOR CLASSROOM OBSERVATIONS

by Carol Jago
Santa Monica High School, California

When after a long hiatus I was asked to take a student teacher and act as a master teacher, I knew I was out of the habit and possibly out of some bad habits.

My new student teacher, Kelly, had completed a semester of observation at another high school and now was charged by her university to teach a class from start to finish, solo. The class she was given was a challenge to say the least: a class made up of 27 remedial students, grades 9–12, mostly minorities, and largely male. I knew that any interference from me would badly undermine her credibility with the students, so I planned to be in the classroom, highly visible, and yet entirely occupied. I decided to use an adaptation of the double-entry journal I had been requiring of my own students to respond to Kelly's teaching as she took over "my" class.

The activity of writing in the double-entry journal solved the problem of making it clear who was in charge, because it was obvious to the students that Kelly was. I smiled and said nothing to the students; yet, they could see that I was totally involved in the lesson, my eyes and ears alert for all nuances.

The Double-Entry Journal

I divided the pages of a spiral notebook in two, one-half for observation, the other for evaluation. I labeled the columns, "What I See" and "What I Think," and for the next six weeks scribbled nonstop.

For example, one page of the journal contained these comments under the observation heading "What I See":

1. When Marianne described the difference between monologue and dialogue, I don't think the rest of the class heard.
2. Giving them the chance to explain what they didn't understand was fruitful. Jaime heard what you said to do but couldn't break the instructions down into workable parts.
3. When you were helping Frank at his desk, you had your back to the rest of them.

Across the page in the other column under the evaluation heading "What I Think," I wrote the corresponding comments:

1. No harm having her repeat what she said more loudly.
2. Giving clear instructions doesn't always mean giving more explanation. Sometimes it means simpler. Try writing down for yourself exactly what you plan to give them for directions.
3. Dangerous! If you worked with him side by side you could still keep an eye on the others.
4. I think the student would have sensed a difference had I been grading papers while all this was happening.

Feedback without Interference

Writing in the double-entry journal kept me from interrupting to correct or "help" Kelly. I became so occupied, even addicted to taking notes, that I was more interested in the lesson as a laboratory experiment than in setting things straight at that moment. This intellectual distance allowed me to make practical and specific suggestions for solving problems and achieved much more for me in the long run than my stepping in with a magic touch ever would have. Another advantage to the journal was that I could respond to things as they happened, tiny but important moments, that even by the end of the period I would certainly have forgotten.

I also began to realize that many of the things I did instinctively to keep a friendly order in the classroom were foreign to Kelly, things like only letting one student at a time go to the bathroom. We forget just how much we've learned from our years in the trenches.

Kelly was delighted by the quantity of feedback she received at the end of the day's lesson. (I filled a spiral notebook in six weeks.) And she received it immediately while the flush of success, or failure, was still on her cheeks. As the bell rang, I would simply hand her the notebook. Like most teachers, I had another class the next period, and a conference at that time was impossible. Even if we had wanted to meet at another time of the day, neither of us had a spare hour to debrief the lesson the way my notes did.

More traditional, almost generic remarks on an evaluation, such as "Try to smile more," "Your directions aren't clear," and "Good work," are very difficult for student teachers to translate into action. In contrast, Kelly could act on my comments in the double-entry journal because they were so specific, positive or negative. Each of my evaluative remarks is tied to an observation. For example, Kelly received this page after a poetry class.

What I See:

1. Ignore the groans when you say "poetry."
2. Your reading of the poem was a bit fast and expressionless.
3. Good fielding of their comments on the text.

What I Think:

1. By defending yourself you lend credibility to their careless comments.
2. Practice.
3. You have a good ear for their thoughtful remarks. I think Frank surprised himself by his answer. It was hard for me not to jump into this discussion as I know and like this poem very much.

Conclusion

Kelly's supervising professors from the university were delighted by the wealth of data they had to read about her. A detailed, anecdotal picture of Kelly's student teaching experience took the pressure off her to perform magic on the three days of the semester they came to observe. Clearly, she had some difficulties; clearly, she was finding solutions; and clearly, she was becoming a capable teacher.

As we attempt to train the army of new teachers that California and the nation will need in the near future, master teachers need strategies for coping. If we want the very best teachers to serve as models, we need to remember that these are the individuals who are most overburdened by department responsibilities, honors classes, and professional commitments. We need to help each other find ways to meet the challenge of inspiring and guiding a new generation of colleagues. Keeping a double-entry journal worked for me.

FROM CLINICAL TO COLLEGIAL TO SELF-DIRECTED: A PROGRESSIVE MODEL OF SUPERVISION AND EVALUATION

by Susan Benjamin
Highland Park High School,
and Janice Jordan
Deerfield High School, Illinois

Most teachers probably remember the shock of their first written performance evaluation. Whether positive or negative, teachers are often puzzled by their supervisors' perceptions and methods of data gathering. Supervision and evaluation provoke very different reactions in teachers. Some teachers view supervision as an odious interference in their well-planned instruction—a waste of time filled with bureaucratic "how-to's" constructed by adversarial, unsympathetic administrators. Other teachers willingly participate in the supervisory process and view supervision and evaluation as structures to enhance professional growth.

In order to come close to a "best case" scenario, the supervisory process should be individual, meeting the needs of teachers based on their levels of experience, skill, and personal development. Our district—District 113, comprised of Highland Park and Deerfield High Schools in Illinois—addresses the changing needs of staff development through a progressive model, a differentiated approach to teacher supervision and evaluation. In this three-pronged program, teachers begin with clinical supervision and move to collegial and self-directed supervision, gain professional expertise, and feel the need to challenge themselves. In all three approaches, the department chair, the primary supervisor, serves as a mentor to the teachers, acting as one who facilitates their professional growth.

Clinical Supervision

The clinical supervision model removes most of the surprises teachers remember about supervision and evaluation because supervision is "close up" in this model. The supervisor and teacher work together all year to enhance instruction and to concentrate on the formative, as well as the summative, aspects of evaluation.

The clinical supervision model begins with a goal conference at the opening of the school year. Teachers write academic performance objectives and share those objectives with their department chair during a conference in September. In addition to standard academic objectives, some performance objectives such as enhancing students' responsibility, promoting interdisciplinary study, and improving school climate may relate to all-school goals.

In early fall, classroom observations begin the clinical cycle in earnest. Each observation is a three-hour process, with a preobservation conference, the classroom observation, and the postobservation conference. In the preobservation conference, the teacher submits to the department chair a preliminary lesson plan which includes the learning objectives of the lesson, the activities the teacher will use to accomplish the objectives, and an evaluation component suggesting how the teacher will measure to what extent the objectives have been accomplished. During the conference, the teacher and department chair work together on the plan, sharing strategies of how to make the lesson work most effectively. In this manner, the department chair serves as a helpful colleague who is invested in the lesson design. The collaborative work before the lesson helps to alleviate some of the tension a teacher normally feels when being observed and evaluated.

During the classroom observation, the department chair takes notes in script-tape form; few, if any, evaluative comments are written during the lesson itself because the purpose of the visit is for the department chair to observe and record. Generally speaking, the observer tries not to be a "presence" in the class and tries to avoid overt nonverbal behaviors. The goal is to observe in the most "normal" situation possible.

The postobservation conference takes place a day or two after the observation. The department chair is given the option of sharing the written report with the teacher before or during the conference, or may choose to write the report after the conference as a record of both the classroom observation and the conference. If the written report is given to the teacher at the time of the conference, the report may serve as the agenda for the conference. During the postobservation conference, the department chair may begin the dialogue with questions, such as "What did you think was the most successful part of the lesson?" "If you could go back and change a given section, which aspect of the lesson would you change? Why?" In the postobservation conference, the goals for both the department chair and the teacher involve sharing perceptions and discussing strategies for improving future lessons.

In our district, five complete clinical cycles (preobservation conference, observation, and postobservation conference) must be concluded by the end of February for nontenured teachers. An assistant principal also visits the classes of nontenured teachers twice before March and provides feedback through follow-up conferences and written reports. In addition, by the end of January the department chair writes two summary progress reports concerning each nontenured teacher which are routed to the assistant principal and principal. By the first of March, the department chair provides a final evaluation, a lengthy summative document, to the teacher. After the teacher signs the final evaluation, the department chair sends the evaluation to the assistant principal and principal for their signatures. This summative document is kept in the teacher's file in the district office.

Through clinical supervision, teachers profit from the emphasis on discussing instructional strategies and augmenting diagnostic skills. Tenured teachers must be clinically supervised every other year, with a minimum of one clinical cycle and a summative evaluation document submitted by the department chair by June. In addition, mature and highly skilled teachers may direct their own professional growth every other year, by choosing from two other supervisory options, collegial consultation and self-directed supervision.

Collegial Consultation

Collegial consultation is a long-term staff development program in our district that trains volunteer participants to work as peers in collegial teams. Team members observe each other's professional work and offer support and strategies for improvement. Participants also learn to apply diagnostic teaching skills to themselves and others and to view themselves as change agents in classrooms.

The four-member interdisciplinary collegial teams participate in an intensive summer workshop and work together to improve their instructional skills all year. The training takes place in a week-long summer workshop with two follow-up Saturday morning inservice sessions designed to focus on topics suggested by participants, such as cooperative learning or reading-as-process strategies. Participants are provided with classroom substitutes for their collegial consultation sessions during the school year. The staff training component of any peer supervision program is essential to its success; in our district, this training emphasizes four main elements:

1. Teachers learn to observe clinically a colleague's classes, looking for those areas of concern that the colleague asks them to address.
2. Teachers learn to give feedback to a colleague, identifying strengths and weaknesses, in ways which minimize defensiveness and denial.
3. Teachers learn to coach colleagues in the use of effective teaching strategies.
4. Teachers learn to observe their group's process skills and develop their group's ability to reflect diagnostically on classroom operations.

Each teacher is observed three times a year by colleagues. Teachers direct their preobservation conferences so that observation time is maximized to meet their needs. In addition to observations conducted by the collegial team, teachers are also observed at least once by the department chair, who writes the summative performance evaluation at the end of the year. The program is successful because it places teachers at the center of their own professional development with the support and expertise of peer coaches. Evaluations of the program by the staff involved indicate that they find it enormously beneficial and professionally energizing.

Self-Directed Supervision

In the progressive model of supervision and evaluation, master teachers, or teachers who are ready to take responsibility for their own professional growth, move to the self-directed supervisory model. As with the other supervisory models, the year begins in self-directed supervision with a goal conference between the teacher and department chair in which the teacher sets forth performance objectives for the year. In contrast to the other models, one of the performance objectives must focus specifically on the teacher's professional growth. The explanation of the professional growth objective must contain a number of concrete strategies which will be used to accomplish the objective and a method of determining the extent of the attainment of the objective.

In the self-directed model, teachers monitor their own performance regarding the accomplishment of their objectives and write their own summative performance evaluation at the end of the year. During the year, the department chair serves as a resource, available upon request, to help with progress toward meeting objectives. Although no formal classroom observation is required of any administrator during a teacher's "self-directed" year, the department chair may wish to observe at least one lesson in order to help provide data to the teacher for the summative evaluation.

Although the self-directed model requires teachers to take on a great deal of work and responsibility, they find the model gratifying because they are empowered to direct their own professional growth. Teachers undertake the burden of their own assessment conscientiously and willingly. To date the teacher-written summative evaluations received in the Highland Park and Deerfield English departments have been insightful and honest.

A Progressive Model

Through allowing teachers choices of supervisory models, teachers can take charge of a significant aspect of their professional growth. Clinical, collegial, and self-directed models of supervision and evaluation provide opportunities for teachers to diagnose their own and others' teaching proficiencies and to reflect on which strategies lead to effective instruction. Good teachers rarely remain static in their approaches to instruction; they grow and change through the years. The manner in which teachers are supervised and evaluated should reflect their increasing professional sophistication. A progressive model of supervision and evaluation can create a situation in which teachers participate willingly and actively in a process which truly enhances professional growth.

SUPERVISION MEANS RECOGNITION

by Betty C. Sisco
Center Grove High School, Greenwood, Indiana

One of the most important roles of the department chairperson is that of nourishing and sustaining those teachers for whom she shares a responsibility. I have learned through experience as a department chairperson for eleven years that teachers will not only respond positively to having their expertise recognized but will also strive to enhance their commitment to their profession.

Recognition

Expertise deserves recognition. The drama coach and the speech team coach frequently receive public accolades. The newspaper and yearbook advisers are recognized as well. Furthermore, those with special endorsements, such as the reading specialist, are regularly acknowledged and called upon to share their expertise. In the English department, where so many talents are continually exhibited, the department chairperson might assume that any personal acknowledgment of those talents is superfluous. Yet if the department chairperson does not applaud those teachers within her department who go "above and beyond," they may begin to feel that their supervisor does not value their efforts.

Acknowledgment

The type of recognition a department chairperson adopts varies with each situation. In some instances I have used the opportunity to provide levity to serious circumstances; for example, during a recent department meeting, I presented a calendar of "far away" places in recognition of extraordinary service to the teacher who has the largest single class. Another time I volunteered to take a class period for the two teachers who have the most students, recognizing their heavy class load. At another meeting I gave a huge candy bar to the little-known Spell Bowl advisor in recognition of winning the district spelling bowl contest.

For those who prefer a more formal stance, I would suggest asking those teachers who have developed innovative lesson plans to share their ideas with the staff during department meetings or asking the principal to observe the teacher who has developed a special rapport with a particular class. These gestures affirm a teacher's professionalism. On a personal level, I have even advised a teacher who seems especially stressed out with "all there is to do" simply to disregard responding to homework for a day or two. You can imagine the grateful expression I received when I suggested that the teacher reward herself by designating one day a week when she will not take papers home.

Notes of Appreciation

As department chairpersons, we must also be conscientious in writing notes of appreciation. Thanking the drama coach after a production and the yearbook sponsor as the new yearbook is being distributed are tangible methods of identifying not only their talents but also their worth to the department. I certainly treasure the notes I have received from appreciative colleagues and former students; moreover, I believe every teacher has a cache of such notes tucked away somewhere.

And what will be the consequences of these gestures of recognition? It has been my experience that teachers who are appreciated are more willing to accept leadership responsibility

within the department. In addition, they approach me more readily with suggestions or concerns. Above all, the members of the department are quite cheerful and cooperative with one another.

Quite simply, when the department chairperson regularly acknowledges her teachers' efforts, a positive climate will be created in which teachers may work and—even more significant—their level of instruction will improve. Supervision means recognition.

LEADING WITH IMAGINATION

by Paul C. Bellin
Weld County School District, Greeley, Colorado
Program Chair, 1990 CSSEDC Convention

The theme of the 1990 CSSEDC Convention (November 18-21), "Leading with Imagination," will be highlighted by the speakers featured at the conference. Bill McBride, professor of English at Colorado State University, former teacher and English department chairperson, will deliver the keynote address on Monday morning. McBride's talk, entitled "I Taught Them Baseball," will focus on the "power and influence that teachers wield" as teachers go about the business of providing a meaningful education for their students. Drawing on his experiences as elementary, secondary, and college teacher, and citing the words and actions of outside experts "who tell how we must reform what we do," McBride reaffirms his faith and ours that we know what to do, and from positions of school, department, and classroom leadership, that we can do it. McBride is currently editor of *High Interest—Easy Reading* for NCTE and coauthor of *A Guide to Literature for Young Adults: Background, Selection, and Use*.

Following Tuesday's breakfast, Thomas Sergiovanni, author of *Handbook for Effective Department Leadership in Today's Secondary Schools*, will challenge traditional thinking in his address to the convention on "The Moral Dimensions of Leadership." Sergiovanni, Radford Professor of Education and Administration at Trinity University in San Antonio, will provide an alternative to "the limitations of relying on traditional management theory as a basis for leadership." Traditional management theory relies on bureaucratic and psychological authority and breeds "subordinateness." Moral authority, the alternative to traditional management theory, puts its emphasis on building followership. According to Sergiovanni, followers "readily give more than they have to"—unlike subordinates, who "do what they are supposed to and little else."

Joseph Tsujimoto, English teacher at Punahou School, Honolulu, will offer his thoughts on "The Affective Teacher," following lunch on Tuesday. Tsujimoto calls for a greater balance between affect and intellect in our teaching, recognizing the enormous power in the former, the affective domain. Tsujimoto will suggest ways that leaders can energize others so that "they may exploit their own passions," and, in so doing, "arouse a similar passion for language and learning in their students." Tsujimoto will speak from the perspective of teacher, writer, member of the National Writing Project Advisory Board, and representative to the 1987 English Coalition Conference.

The Wednesday breakfast will be followed by an address from Beverly Harvard, deputy chief of police in Atlanta, Georgia. Harvard will address the theme, "Leading with Imagination," from a perspective outside the realm of schooling.

The theme of the convention addressed by the speakers at the general sessions will be treated by thirty presenters in a variety of formats during the three days of the convention. Roundtable sessions on Monday morning will focus on teacher education (sponsored by the Urban Schools Committee), portfolios, curriculum, the Hunter model of classroom management, and school organization. On Monday afternoon and Tuesday morning, workshops and concurrent sessions will treat topics as varied as staff development, collaborative learning, tracking, leadership, administration, departmental assessment, and the AP program.

On Tuesday morning, the Conference on English Education will conduct a workshop on mentoring, and the Rural Arts Committee will sponsor a session on humanities in the rural setting. A session on writing for publication will again be offered with the editor of the *CSSEDC Quarterly*, and another session will address reading and writing workshops. The Tuesday afternoon sessions will focus on gifted students and students at risk, the writing process and publishing, and scripts in literature and life. Some strands established on Monday will be continued: collaborative learning, writing centers, humanities, curriculum, and leadership.

On Wednesday morning there will be two concurrent sessions rather than the roundtable meetings of the past several years. One session will focus on the needs of the first-year teachers, the other on three ventures in teaching poetry.

The variety of topics for each day shows that imagination is truly a key factor in leadership. Former participants might notice that the format of the convention has been changed considerably. Key topics will be presented in more than one session; however, speakers will not appear more than once. More workshops (7) and more roundtable sessions (5) will be offered. The planning committee has arranged a program that affords several opportunities for interaction among the participants.

What has not changed for this convention are the three evening social events. Participants have found the evening socials to be excellent opportunities for informal discussion of the convention and for sharing their work interests. Not changed is the fact that the three social events and the four meals are included in the registration fee. There are no extra costs. Not changed will be the excitement, the learning, and the sharing of challenges that are always a part of a CSSEDC Convention.

Software Review

NORTON TEXTRA WRITER 2.0 WITH ONLINE HANDBOOK

by Wendy Paterson
Buffalo State College, New York

If high school English departments are serious about preparing their students for collegiate writing, they would be well advised to initiate a word-processing literacy component. Of all the computer-assisted instruction programs available to enrich or supplement college programs, a good word processor is more useful to students than any other. For this purpose, *Norton Textra Writer 2.0 with Online Handbook*, published by W. W. Norton and Company, is ideal. It is simple to learn and contains features that encourage correct English skills. Its "Works Cited" feature and accompanying explanation of MLA and APA styles in the online handbook also make the more picayune trials of doing research papers much less traumatic.

Several of our instructors adopted *Textra Writer* to teach to their sections of first-year composition because it is easy for students to learn, flexible, research-oriented, and a program with a dynamite spell checker.

Easily accessible features allow students to consult an online handbook, to reformat indefinitely, to get help at any time, and to make revisions painlessly. Its built-in handbook lets students

"look up" helpful information about grammar, punctuation, documentation, sentence structure, usage, and mechanics. While they are reading handbook information, students can freeze and split the screen to leave the information visible while they apply it to a specific part of their writing. The spell check feature is remarkably "intelligent" and has become a real selling point, especially for our learning-disabled students.

Research paper format is present (one-inch margins, double-space, etc.) and easy to change. A new feature for research is the "Works Cited" feature, allowing authors to enter bibliographic information while the appropriate style guide (either APA or MLA) is frozen on a split screen. *Textra Writer* then spaces, indents, and alphabetizes the entries to create a "Works Cited" page that can be modified easily.

Because it has a simple and thorough set of tutorial lessons (chosen to suit level of ability) students may teach themselves to use the program in a very short time. Mastery of all of its features comes in time.

This semester provided an excellent chance for us to evaluate this software and decide whether to continue to use *Textra Writer*. Students, faculty, lab personnel, and administrators who worked with us were unanimous in approving it as a standard for word processing. Faculty members who have previously hidden their fear of learning the word processor are now bravely stepping forth to learn *Textra Writer* along with their classes. Converts from other programs are common.

In our basic skills computer lab we have used this program as the cornerstone of our effort to make the entire college word-processing literate. We have used it to teach classes in psychology, art education, exceptional education, technical education, nutrition and food science, English, philosophy, biology, reading and study skills, and a variety of others. Instructors of writing-intensive courses and first-year seminar courses were invited to bring their classes to our Title III computer lab to learn word processing, an offer that was enthusiastically received. Instructors felt more comfortable about requiring word-processed papers and even more comfortable about suggesting revisions for students who wanted to improve their grades on papers. Students have been uniformly enthusiastic about the program, and word of mouth continues to bring many students to our lab to learn it independently.

After one semester of piloting the program with more than 500 students in our basic skills computer lab, we are convinced that *Textra Writer* is the finest student-oriented word-processing package available for college use. I know that it has also been enthusiastically received at the high school level.

CALLS FOR MANUSCRIPTS— PLANS FOR FUTURE ISSUES

The *CSSEDC Quarterly*, a publication of the Conference for Secondary School English Department Chairpersons of NCTE, seeks articles of 250-3,000 words on topics of interest to English department leaders. Informal, firsthand accounts of successful department activities are encouraged.

Recent surveys of our readers reveal these topics of interest: leadership training for the new department chair, class size/class load, support from the business community, at-risk student programs, problems for rural schools, reading/writing centers, and whole language curriculum. Short articles on these and other concerns are published in every issue. In addition, upcoming issues will have these themes:

February 1991 (November 1 deadline):
Whole Language in the High School

May 1991 (February 1 deadline):
The Learning Labels: At-risk; LD; Dyslexia; Remedial

October 1991 (July 1 deadline):
The Changing Literature Class

December 1991 (September 15 deadline):
Measures of Student Performance

Manuscripts may be sent on 5.25- or 3.5-inch floppy disks, with IBM compatible ASCII files or as traditional double-spaced typed copy.

Address articles and inquiries to: James Strickland, Editor, *CSSEDC Quarterly*, English Department, Slippery Rock University of Pennsylvania, 16057-1326.

CSSEDC Election Slate 1990

CANDIDATES FOR ASSOCIATE CHAIRPERSON (VOTE FOR ONE)

PAUL C. BELLIN, Humanities Coordinator, Weld County School District #6, 811 15th Street, Greeley, Colorado 80631. **Offices:** NCTE: CEE Commission on Supervision and Curriculum Development; CEE Commission on the States; CSSEDC Program Chair, 1990; Colorado Language Arts Society (CLAS): Director of Conferences, Former President, First Vice President, Chairperson of Long Range Planning Committee, Chairperson of Competence Testing Committee, Executive Committee, Member-at-Large, Chairperson of the Regional Conference; Phi Delta Kappa, University of Northern Colorado Chapter: Former Vice President for Membership; Kiwanis Club of the Rockies: Member of the Board of Directors, Past President; Weld Information and Referral Service: Former Member of Board of Directors; Greeley City Council: Former Member of Steering Committee to form a Youth Commission; Bicentennial Commission: Former Coordinator of Celebration of Bicentennial of the U.S. Constitution, 4th Congressional District of Colorado. **Member**: NCTE, CLAS, CSSEDC, ALAN, IRA, Colorado Council of IRA, Weld County Council of IRA, Phi Delta Kappa, ASCD, Kiwanis. **Publications:** Colorado ASCD, "Staff Development," position paper (coauthor), 1987. **Program Participant**: National Elementary Language Arts Conference, "Problem Solving for Elementary Students"; University of Colorado Reading Conference, presentations on censorship; Title I Advisory Council Workshop, Denver, "TV and Teenagers: Stimulation or Stagnation?"; CCIRA Convention, "Choosing Books: Challenge, Lost Cause, or Absurdity," "How to Develop a District Content-Area Inservice Team"; Colorado Department of Education, Basic Skills Conference, "District Inservice: A Team Approach"; Right-to-Read training session, "Dealing with Censorship in Your Community"; University of Northern Colorado (UNC), Annual Reading Conference, "Censorship"; UNC, Summer Reading Workshop, "Colorado Children's Book Award Selections and Censorship"; UNC, "Responsibilities of Content-Area Teachers for Teaching Writing," opening session of Reading and Writing in the Content Fields Program; CLAS, "Moral Development Theory and the Impact of Television on Youth"; UNC, Reading and Writing in the Content Fields, "The Language of Evaluation: Reaction to Dr. Mellon's Address"; UNC, Annual Reading Conference, Panel, "Reader's Choice vs.

Censorship in Selection"; UNC, Annual Reading Conference, Keynote Address, "Censorship and Captivating Readers through Literature."

Position Statement: The officers of an organization are elected to serve the members. The officers of CSSEDC have served the members well. Since our work is never finished, however, I see tasks remaining in both membership and service that we must do. First, not all English language arts leaders are members of CSSEDC. The officers must mobilize the present membership to recruit those who are not with us so that they, too, may benefit from the services that CSSEDC provides. Second, many English language arts leaders are unable to accomplish what they think they should because they are denied time or authority to do so. In addition, many are compensated meanly and denied opportunities to interact with their peers. In effect, they are denied opportunities to use the services of CSSEDC. Our task is to find ways to keep the importance of department leadership before school boards and school administrators so that all students will benefit from the improved English language arts programs that result from active, rewarding leadership in schools and school districts. If elected to the position of Associate Chair, I will strive through the Executive Committee to increase both the membership of and service to the members of CSSEDC.

MARY ELLEN THORNTON, Principal, Patrick Henry Middle School, Houston Independent School District, Houston, Texas. **Offices:** CSSEDC Member-at-Large, 1986–89; Houston Area Council of Teachers of English Executive Board Liaison to Texas Joint Council of Teachers of English, 1990–91; Chairperson of Scholarship Committee, HACTE, 1985–88; Past President, HACTE, 1986–87; Cochair of Hospitality Committee for TJCTE, Spring Convention, 1991; Program Chairperson for Metro Council of Teachers of English, 1987; Audio Visual Aids Chairperson for NCTE, 1985; Vice Chairperson, Journalism Division Planning Committee, NCTE, 1966; Chairperson of Scholarship Committee, Alpha Delta Kappa, 1984–91; and Past President of Spring Oaks, 1982–83, and Spring Woods PTA, 1985–87. **Member:** CSSEDC, NCTE, HACTE, MCTE, Kappa Delta Pi, Alpha Delta Kappa, ASCD, SLATE, Harris County Language Arts Steering Committee, and Houston Association of School Administrators. **Publications**: Curriculum writer for honors and eleventh-grade on-level English curriculum for Houston Independent School District and for first-year English syllabus for University of Southwestern Louisiana; former editor of Houston Baptist University *News*. **Awards**: Principal of the year, District XI, Houston Independent School District, 1990; Honorary Texas PTA Life Membership, 1990; and Alpha Chi. **Program Participant**: CSSEDC, 1981–86; NCTE, HACTE, Harris County Journalism Teachers, Katy Independent School District honors teachers, Writing Across the Curriculum inservice for Houston Administrators, and Middle School Assembly of NCTE.

Position Statement: My experience with students and teachers from Pre-K through the university level provides me with a strong background to lead CSSEDC. Most of my twenty-seven years in education have been spent in grades 6–12 as an English teacher, English chairperson, and English supervisor. As a dean of instruction and now as a principal, I recognize an urgent need to promote writing in the content areas, writing to learn, smaller class size, and less emphasis on standardized testing. The twenty-first century will need English leaders with a vision, leaders who empower, and leaders who inspire. Weaving and blending the intricacies of a multicultural society, English leaders will have monumental challenges to face. Having actively participated in CSSEDC since 1980, I feel that I can enhance the role of CSSEDC in training and developing fresh, dynamic leadership. Together, we must work to find, challenge, and develop strong leadership in English across the nation.

CANDIDATES FOR MEMBERS-AT-LARGE (VOTE FOR TWO)

KRISTINA M. ELIAS, Instructional Leader of English, West Hartford Public Schools, West Hartford, Connecticut. **Offices:** President, Connecticut CTE; Past President, Connecticut Heads of English Departments; Advisory Board of NEATE (Northeast Association of Teachers of English); Past Nominations Chair of CSSEDC. **Member:** CCTE, CHED, ASCD, NEATE, NCTE, CSSEDC. **Publications:** *Connecticut English Journal*, "Another Look at Grammar," 1985; *Academic Connections*, College Board, "English at Madison High," Summer, 1989. **Awards**: Department chair of Farmington High School when they received NCTE Center for Excellence Award in Writing, 1985; Teacher of the Year, Coventry High School, 1977. **Program Participant**: NCTE, Spring, 1983; NCTE, Spring, 1988; CSSEDC, Fall, 1985, 1986, 1987.

Position Statement: My philosophy of leadership is a simple one. Leadership is any activity which "enables" those in a constituency to feel important, to feel challenged, to feel rewarded, and to feel appreciated. If elected to the CSSEDC Board, I promise to advocate and actively seek the involvement of as many members as possible, to listen to your many voices and represent those multiplicities of opinions in policy-making, and to work as hard as I possibly can to be known and trusted by the CSSEDC community.

DANIEL A. HELLER, English Department Head, Brattleboro Union High School, Brattleboro, Vermont 05301. **Offices**: NCTE Committee on Peer Evaluation Designs. **Member**: NCTE, CSSEDC, ASCD, NEA. **Publications**: "Peer Supervision: A Way of Professionalizing Teaching," *Phi Delta Kappa Fastback*, No. 286; ERIC Document on Peer Supervision; Roundtable article, *English Journal*, April 1989. **Program Participant**: Presentation on Peer Supervision, 1987 CSSEDC, 1988 CSSEDC, 1989 NCTE (Spring), 1990 NCTE (Fall); Presentation on Teacher Empowerment, 1990 CSSEDC.

Position Statement: The concept of leadership as applied to the English department head is an ironic one. Instead of having more people working for me, I now work for more people. As a classroom teacher, my job was to serve the needs of my students as best I could. Now, I must serve the needs of my students and my fellow English teachers. To lead is to serve. By helping to provide for teachers a supportive professional environment, one

in which they feel secure to experiment, one in which they are valued, one in which they are free to grow, the department head serves the students. CSSEDC is an organization devoted to serving those who serve others. By becoming more active in CSSEDC I can expand my opportunities to serve the profession and thereby expand my professional self. To climb the educational career ladder is to continue to increase the numbers of people to whom one is responsible. To work for CSSEDC is to work for students, teachers, and other department heads and educational leaders.

MARY PAULINE McELROY, English Coordinator for Cy-Fair Independent School District and Director of Instruction of Jersey Village High School, 7600 Solomon, Houston, Texas 77040. **Offices**: Texas Joint Council of Teachers of English, Corresponding Secretary, 1979–1980, and Chairperson of the Nominating Committee 1983–1984; Houston Area Council of Teachers of English, Recording Secretary, 1978–1979, and Parliamentarian, 1979–1980. **Member**: NCTE, NASSP, ASCD, CSSEDC. **Publications**: Implemented the International Baccalaureate program for four Houston I.S.D. high schools and at Jersey Village High School in Cy-Fair I.S.D. **Awards**: Since I have been in Cy-Fair, I have received the following awards: The Friends of Jersey Village Drama Award; nominated by the local art teachers and then awarded at the state level the Friends of Art Award; asked to be the administrative chaperon of the Falcon band; and awarded a plaque of appreciation from the E.S.O.L. class. I received a letter of appreciation from central office vocational personnel for my active and visible support of vocational students and teachers. **Program Participant**: Have presented and chaired programs for NCTE and CSSEDC and affiliates since 1978.

Position Statement: I would consider it a professional honor to serve on the Board of CSSEDC. This is the organization that has provided the specific support, assistance, and growth to me in my role as a supervisor of English. I would appreciate the opportunity to actively plan and work for CSSEDC to in some small measure repay the help it has given me.

NANCY W. SINDELAR, Dean of Instruction for Humanities, Morton West High School, 2400 S. Home Avenue, Berwyn, Illinois 60402. **Offices**: Adjunct Faculty, Loyola University, Chicago, 1988 to present; Adjunct Faculty, National College of Education, Evanston, 1987 to present; Consultant, Bellon and Associates, 1987 to present. **Member**: NCTE, National Council of Teachers of Social Studies, Illinois Association of Teachers of English, Illinois Association of Teachers of Foreign Language, ASCD, Phi Delta Kappa (Loyola University Chapter), National Organization for Legal Problems in Education, Association of School Business Officials. **Publications**: "Are You Teaching Your Students to Dislike Writing," *Lutheran Education*, September-October, 1984; "Freedom of Speech and the Incompetent/Competent Teacher," *West's Education Law Reporter*, July, 1987 (coauthor); "Teacher Incompetence and Employer Discrimination," *West's Education Law Reporter*, November, 1987, (coauthor); "English Curriculum and Higher Education: What Colleges and Universities Are Telling Secondary Schools," *Journal of College Admissions*, Summer, 1988; "Teacher Mentorship," *Phi Delta Kappa Fastback Series*, forthcoming (coauthor). **Awards**: Recipient of Women and Minorities in Administration Full-Tuition Scholarship, 1986. **Program Participant**: "Mentorship and the Development of the Professional Educator," ASCD, San Antonio, 1990; "What Colleges are Looking for from High School English Programs," CSSEDC, Baltimore, 1989; "Processing the Process: Secondary Writing Programs That Promote a Philosophy of Writing Across the Curriculum," CCCC, St. Louis, 1988; "Writer's Workbench and Student Writing Labs," Illinois Principals' Association, Lombard, 1987; Copresenter of six-hour Action Lab, "Writing and Renewal: How Workshops on Teaching Writing Provide New Methods and New Dedication," ASCD, Chicago, 1985; "Faculty Evaluation for the Improvement of Instruction: A System That Works," CSSEDC, Philadelphia, 1985.

Position Statement: CSSEDC conventions, publications, and formal and informal networks provide English department chairs across the country with a broad range of opportunities to refine their leadership skills. Whether a presenter or a listener at the convention, a contributor or reader of the newsletter, one becomes a more knowledgeable, skillful leader because of CSSEDC experiences. As for networking, CSSEDC offers professional friendship and colleagueship as well as support when the challenges of being chairperson seem overwhelming. For the past six years I have taken advantage of and reaped benefits from the friendship, colleagueship, and presentation and publication opportunities offered by CSSEDC. As a member-at-large I will nurture as well as seek to augment these professional opportunities so that CSSEDC will continue to attract and develop vital, knowledgeable professional educators.

CSSEDC ORGANIZATIONAL NAME CHANGE

After two years of discussion and deliberation, the CSSEDC Executive Committee has decided to recommend that the Conference for Secondary School English Department Chairpersons change its name.

The rationale behind this recommendation is manifold. The acronym is long and defies pronunciation. Our membership is no longer comprised only of "secondary" school people; many of us have middle school, college, or K–12 assignments. Our name tends to define us too narrowly, sending potential members looking elsewhere for professional affiliation. For these reasons, the CSSEDC Executive Committee presents this name change ballot for your consideration. Understand that if a name change is approved by our voting membership, this will go before the Executive Board of NCTE for their final approval; they have a final authority over matters such as these within the Council as a whole.

BALLOT INSTRUCTIONS

The CSSEDC Bylaws permit members to vote either by mail or at the CSSEDC business session of the annual fall conference. Each member mailing a ballot should mark it and mail it in an envelope with a *return name and address* to Willa Mae Kippes, P. O. Box 302, 401 12th Street, Gilcrest, Colorado 80623. Please mark "Ballot" on the outside of the envelope.

Ballots must be postmarked no later than November 5, 1990. Members who prefer voting at the conference will be given a ballot and an envelope at the business session of CSSEDC. An institution with membership may designate one individual as the one person to vote on its behalf. Please list the institution name and address on the outside of the envelope.

CSSEDC BALLOT—1990

Associate Chairperson: Vote for One

_____ Paul C. Bellin
_____ Mary Ellen Thornton
_____ _____ _____
(Write-in Candidate)

Members-at-Large: Vote for Two

_____ Kristina M. Elias
_____ Daniel A. Heller
_____ Mary Pauline McElroy
_____ Nancy W. Sindelar
_____ _____
(Write-in Candidate)

Organizational Name Change: Check One

_____ Conference on English Department Leade. (CEDL)
_____ Conference on English Leadership (CEL)
_____ no change

CSSEDC Executive Committee

Chair
Wendell Schwartz
Stevenson High School
16070 West Highway 22
Prairie View, Illinois 60069

Associate Chair
Myles Eley
Warren Central High School
9500 East 16th Street
Indianapolis, Indiana 46229

Past Chair
Emil J. Sanzari
Paramus High School
East Century Road
Paramus, New Jersey 07652

Liaison to NCTE Secondary Section Committee
Carol Compton
Hudson High School
Hudson, Massachusetts 01749

Corresponding Secretary
Susan Hayles-Berbower
Huntington Beach UHSD
10251 Yorktown Avenue
Huntington Beach, CA 92646

Membership Chair
Thomas Jones
Wyoming Valley West High School
Wadham Street
Plymouth, Pennsylvania 18651

Secretary-Treasurer
Miles Myers
NCTE

Staff Liaison
L. Jane Christensen
NCTE

Members-at-Large
Susan Benjamin
Highland Park High School
433 Vine
Highland Park, Illinois 60035

Thomas Fischer
Lyons Township High School
100 S. Brainard Avenue
La Grange, Illinois 60525

Ira Hayes
Syosset High School
South Woods Road
Syosset, New York 11791

Judith M. Kelly
Hine Junior High School
8th and Pennsylvania Avenue, SE
Washington, DC 20003

Deborah Smith McCullar
Dean Morgan Junior High School
1440 S. Elm
Casper, Wyoming 82601

Kevin C. McHugh
Finneytown Jr./Sr. High School
8916 Fountainebleau Terrace
Cincinnati, Ohio 45231

CSSEDC QUARTERLY
National Council of Teachers of English
1111 Kenyon Road
Urbana, Illinois 61801

Nonprofit
Organization
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
Champaign, Illinois
Permit No. 85

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CSSEDC Quarterly

Conference for Secondary School English Department Chairpersons

Volume 12, Number 4
December 1990
Editor: James Strickland

In This Issue

LEADERSHIP

by James Strickland, editor

It seems fitting that this issue of the *Quarterly* focuses upon the most central concern of the Conference which sponsors its publication—Leadership. It is also no coincidence that it comes at a time when the organization is struggling with a name change, hoping to more adequately reflect the broad base of its growing constituency—one no longer limited to chairs of English departments in secondary schools—and their concerns as leaders, regardless of whether they were elected, appointed, or given the role by general consensus.

Leadership is an elusive quality. Leadership presumes followers; it is difficult to imagine a leader without them. Yet, it is more than that. I am reminded of an unusual remark once made by an administrator at my school. The comment was something to the effect that before he went charging up the hill, he wanted to be sure that there were others behind him. It struck me that he saw himself more as a spokesperson for a position than a leader.

A leader needs vision. The hearts of followers are captured by vision, the vision of what could be and what should be.

In the first article, "Leading Classroom Discussions," Sharon Wieland discusses ways to encourage leadership in classrooms like her own at Sacramento High School in California. Rebecca Laubach, in the second article, "Learning to Trust," shares something she learned about leadership when she left her classes at Mars Area High School to a long-term substitute teacher.

Susan Benjamin, chair of the English department at Highland Park High School in Illinois, offers chairpersons several practical suggestions for ways to create a climate for leadership. Further suggestions for leadership are offered by Jeanne Gerlach and Nancy Hoffman, professors of education at West Virginia University, who advocate reflective thinking.

Often the leaders in our nation's schools feel weary and isolated; they need to hear of someone else's success. Terrie St. Michel, the department chair at South Mountain High School in Phoenix, Arizona, tells how her school accomplished schoolwide change. Henry Kiernan, the humanities supervisor at Southern Regional High School in Manahawkin, New Jersey, shares what he learned about leadership through the experience of "Team Building," a concept that transformed his high school.

A leader needs to understand the concerns of the teachers in the department; this understanding shapes what is expected of and offered to the teachers. Bob Small, of Virginia Tech in Blacksburg, examines traditional and romantic views of teachers, speculating about the ramifications each has for leadership. Taking the pulse of the leadership of English departments across the country, Ted Lehmann, English coordinator of Carlisle Area School District in Pennsylvania, reports the continuing concerns of chairpersons, offering for examination the vision of those who are department leaders by virtue of their positions.

Inside . . . **page number**

Leading Classroom Discussions 1
by Sharon Wieland

Learning to Trust 3
by Rebecca Laubach

Creating a Climate for Leadership 4
by Susan Benjamin

Leadership through Reflective Thinking 5
by Jeanne Gerlach and Nancy Hoffman

Leading Schoolwide Change: A Plan for Success . . . 6
by Terrie St. Michel

Continuing Concerns of Department Leaders 7
by Theodore Lehmann II

Traditional and Romantic Views of Teachers 8
by Robert C. Small, Jr.

Team Building: Connecting Substance to Educational Leadership 10
by Henry Kiernan

Calls for Manuscripts 11

LEADING CLASSROOM DISCUSSIONS

by Sharon Wieland
Sacramento High School, California

How would you describe discussions in your classroom? When the textbook directs you to "discuss," what do you picture your students doing? Do you imagine students sitting quietly, politely waiting their turns, remembering not to talk until called upon? I always wanted my students to become so involved in classroom discussions that they would jump into the talk passionately, stating opinions, questioning, arguing a point, providing evidence for

their opinions, challenging, drawing out the ideas of others—almost as in a verbal sword fight.

My vision of the perfect class discussion does not always happen in my classroom. Often my students turn out to be students who do not care whether we have a discussion, who practically have to be forced to participate, who have opinions like, (shrug) "I don't know," who do not question much of anything, who back down easily and counter, "Everybody has a right to their own opinion."

Usually, my students begin the year in my classroom with hesitance. As they enter the writing workshop classroom, they find that I ask them to behave in ways that real writers behave and to make all of their own decisions about writing. They choose their own topics, audiences, and forms for writing, using the resources of the writing workshop room to meet their needs. Many of the students have not experienced this degree of autonomy before. The structure does not meet their expectations of what a classroom is like. The writing workshop asks them to behave in ways that they do not usually associate with school behavior.

Discussion was one aspect of this workshop environment that never worked well at the beginning of the year. When I asked the students to work in peer-response groups, reading their writing to a small group of peers and listening to response, I found them tentative and polite, or rowdy and rude. When I asked them to discuss writing as a whole class, I found that they expected me to take charge of the discussion. Although the discussions began to function the way I had hoped by November or December, I was still bothered that it took so long. Why couldn't my students hold good discussions earlier, at the beginning of the year?

I decided to try to find out just what students think a discussion is, anyway. I hoped to be able to describe a student model of classroom discussion so that I could then compare their model with mine and plan for better discussions.

Because I was, as usual, planning for the coming year during the vacation months of July and August, I set out to find some students to take part in my study. I found 49 summer school and summer sports program participants at a nearby college. With their teachers' permission I conducted an informal survey to describe students' perceptions of "class discussions." This was the quickest, least obtrusive way I could think of to get information from students without disrupting their programs. The questions and informal assessment method were based on two informal studies that describe students' models of reading and writing: a study done by W. Page and G. S. Pinnell, discussed in *Teaching Reading Comprehension* (Urbana: NCTE, 1979), which tried to isolate students' models of reading, and a study done by Pat Hartwell, reported in his paper, "Writers as Readers" (ERIC Document ED 199 701, 1981), which tried to isolate students' models of writing.

I asked the students, who ranged in age from 7 to 14, to write their answers to 3 questions:

1. What are the rules for having a discussion in a classroom?
2. What are the rules for asking a question in a classroom?
3. What are the rules for answering a question in a classroom?

The students' answers to the questions dismayed me. They described classroom discussion that called for student passivity, that was elicitative in nature, and that saw the teacher as authority. In other words, they *expected* the teacher to initiate, direct, and restrict the talk in the classroom. From the first through the seventh grades, this model was well established among the students.

To the question "What are the rules for having a discussion in the classroom?" the students responded similarly:

- Wait until the teacher is finished.
- The teacher has to tell you something.
- Don't talk, listen; be quiet, listen to the teacher.
- Listen to the teacher; no fooling around.
- Raise your hand and wait.

In fact, of the 49 students polled, 90 percent of the responses were of the wait, listen to the teacher, and don't talk variety, and only 10 percent were of the ask questions or give opinions type. A full 100 percent believed the teacher directs the discussion.

When asked "What are the rules for asking a question in a classroom?" they responded in ways that, again, did not fit my model of a discussion:

- Raise hand and wait pashantly [sic].
- Raising your hand and in the proper voice ask the question.
- It must be something the teacher would like to hear.

In responding, 94 percent saw the procedure as raise your hand and wait, while 6 percent felt empowered to ask proper and appropriate questions.

When they were asked the final question—"What are the rules for answering a question in the classroom?"—they again shied from parrying:

- You must know exactly what you are talking about.
- Wait for the teacher to call on you.
- Raise your hand, make sure it is apparent [sic] to the discussion.
- No smart remarks—raise your hand.

The rules for answering for 83 percent of the students depended on procedure—"raise your hand and wait"—more so than the appropriateness of the answers.

How strange that no students suggested that discussions might take place among a group of students without the teacher present, that questions might be used for finding out information, or that answers are ways of explaining one's point in an argument. Of course, I knew that the very phrasing of the questions contributed to much of the way the questions were answered, but, still, I found it curious that the students seemed so much in agreement on their definition of class discussion.

The students viewed their role in the classroom as a passive one. These students had learned to just sit there with hands raised, waiting for the teacher to make all of the decisions. This was quite different from the behavior I wanted to see in my writing workshop class. My seventh and eighth graders came to class with many years of experience in "acceptable school behavior." No wonder my students have difficulty accepting my model of class-

It is the policy of NCTE in its journals and other publications to provide a forum for the open discussion of ideas concerning the content and the teaching of English and the language arts. Publicity accorded to any particular point of view does not imply endorsement by the Executive Committee, the Board of Directors, or the membership at large, except in announcements of policy where such endorsement is clearly specified. Copyright for articles published in *CSSEDC Quarterly* reverts to the respective authors.

CSSEDC Quarterly (ISSN 0738-1409) is published in October, December, February, and May by the National Council of Teachers of English, 1111 Kenyon Road, Urbana, Illinois 61801. Subscription price for the Conference for Secondary School English Department Chairpersons, $10.00 per year. Add $2.00 per year for Canadian and all other international postage. Single copy, $2.50 ($1.50 members). Remittances should be made payable to NCTE by check, money order, or bank draft in U.S. currency. Communications regarding change of address and permission to reprint should be addressed to the National Council of Teachers of English, 1111 Kenyon Road, Urbana, Illinois 61801.

room discussions. I was battling against a perception of acceptable school behavior that had begun in the first grade and become more ingrained with every passing year.

Somewhere along the way students learn that their teachers want and expect a rigid, controlled environment in the classroom. The students' model does not show their teachers listening and learning from children, although Courtney Cazden ("Research Currents: What is Sharing Time For?" *Language Arts* 62: 182–88) suggests that this is just what teachers should do. Their model does not allow children to establish their own rules for turn-taking procedures in discussions, although Steinberg ("Turn-taking Behavior in a Kindergarten Classroom," *Language Arts* 62: 159–65) found that children are perfectly capable of doing so. Their model does not offer much opportunity for teachers to correct nonverbal behaviors which hurt so many children, such as calling on certain students while ignoring others, although Feldman ("Nonverbal Behavior, Race, and the Classroom Teacher," *Theory into Practice*, Winter 1985: 45–49) urges teachers to be aware of and try to change these unproductive and damaging behaviors. The model held by these students demands that they must interpret talk, meanings, situations, and rules—a job that is almost impossible for some students. Only those students who are "teacher wise" are able to participate in the kinds of discussions described in the students' model, although Fillmore ("Language Minority Students and School Participation: What Kind of English is Needed?" *Journal of Education* 164: 143–56) showed that some students suffer because their culture or background prevents them from knowing how to read the teacher.

If students feel they must speak "properly" and "appropriately" and say "something the teacher would like to hear," to what extent can they make discussion a tool that works for them in improving their writing?

As a result of my study, I learned that it would take some time for my students to change into the active writing and discussing students that I wanted them to be. I tried to think of ways that I could help my students begin to use discussion effectively a little earlier in the year, particularly peer response and classroom discussion of writing. I devised five rules for myself as a teacher of writing:

1. Become a listener. In order to become a listener in my classroom, I envisioned myself listening to students rather than "directing" the discussion. I wanted to learn from students and find out how they could direct their own learning in discussions.
2. Check nonverbal behavior. I planned to check my nonverbal behaviors and to seek ways that my nonverbal behaviors could help students to participate in discussions. I also planned to check how my behaviors would show that I valued the contributions all students made to the discussion. I hoped to encourage students from all ethnic and cultural backgrounds to participate more effectively in discussions.
3. Help students become their own interpreters. Helping students become their own interpreters of meanings and situations, rather than having me interpret for them, demanded that I consider each child's differences as unique qualities, not deficits. The writing workshop helped me to do this as I viewed myself as a collaborative writer, learning to write with my students. I know this collaborative stance will necessitate diminishing the role of "teacher as authority."
4. Make "talk" a chief content item of the curriculum, as recommended by Corson ("Social Dialect, The Semantic Barrier, and Access to Curricular Knowledge," *Language in Society* 12: 213–22). I try to structure discussion in the daily writing workshop in ways that are most helpful to writers. I look for natural times when writers need to talk during the composing process and help my students use these discussion times to improve their writing.
5. Finally, a simple rule: eliminate the words "tell me" and "I want you to . . . " from the classroom. Since what I wanted was to help students become active rather than passive members of the discussion, this rule made sense to me after I read an impassioned article by Lucking ("Just Two Words," *Language Arts* 62: 163–74), calling for the elimination of "tell me"—two harmful words that teachers use all of the time. I wanted my students to be active, not passive, listeners in a discussion group. If I told them to "tell me," I took away all chances for them to lead the discussion. If they merely "told me," they would always be acting only because I had decided that they should.

These five rules should help me to help my students become passionately involved in leading discussions. I look forward to students who will thrust and parry at will.

LEARNING TO TRUST

by Rebecca Laubach
Mars Area High School, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

I was not terribly concerned when my obstetrician ordered me to begin my maternity leave six weeks earlier than I had anticipated (but, I would later discover, only four weeks before the birth of my child). I had, after all, just dedicated three weeks worth of planning periods to preparing for my long-term substitute. All of my classes were now neatly encapsulated in a stack of green folders on the lower left-hand corner of my desk, and I felt the changing of the instructional guard should proceed with the sort of ease only weeks of dedicated planning could ensure. As it turned out, I was more right than wrong; unfortunately, this proved to be less a blessing than a curse.

I should begin by confessing that my motives for all of these weeks of planning and organizing were less than benevolent. I had heard all of my colleagues' horror stories concerning their long-term substitutes and, to be honest, I did not want some neophyte rooting through my files, destroying all of my original materials, and, at the end of my leave, handing me back a bunch of classes so far off schedule that I would never complete their course of study before the school year ended. So, I went to work.

I began by photocopying the overviews and assignment sheets for each unit that was to be covered in my absence. I arranged all of these materials in chronological order, annotated them with teaching suggestions, and cross-referenced them with pages in texts and workbooks. Next, I made copies of every quiz, test, and handout I used and inserted them in the appropriate places in my growing (but carefully organized) stacks of materials. I arranged all of this material in the aforementioned green file folders, one for each class, included a table of contents for every folder, and drew up day-by-day calendars highlighting such things as scheduled library days and anticipated tests and quizzes. I included copies of each class's course of study and textbook in each folder. In an additional folder I made notes of grading policies, seating assignments, and general classroom rules. The organizational process took hours of photocopying, scheduling, and sorting, but when I was done, I felt I had really accomplished something. I was sure my replacement could step in so smoothly that my students would never even notice I was gone.

I was right, and I was sorry. I even included my phone number in the files, along with an invitation for my replacement to call me if she "needed anything." I then sat back and waited for the phone to ring. To my dented ego's dismay, the sub called only once, to ask for the door key. Organization, it seems, is fine, but I had organized myself right into obsolescence. I probably could have lived with the knowledge that I was expendable, and maybe I could even have found a measure of pride in the notion that I had made things so "easy" for my successor that she did not need my help, if I had not learned that this was not the case.

Oh, I was indeed replaceable, but my sub's lack of phone calls came not because I had made her job easy, but because she was afraid to ask me any questions. Rather than making life easier for her, all of my planning had only made my replacement's job seem overwhelming. Instead of being pleased with my plans, as I had intended, she found them stifling and oppressive. She saw my schedules and notes not as suggestions, but as rules which she dared not break. Instead of relaxing and enjoying the sixteen weeks she spent with my classes, my replacement spent every day worrying that she would slip off my schedule. She never felt comfortable enough to try something new or to use her own creativity. Thus, my weeks of planning and organizing had not eased my replacement through her first teaching experience; most likely, they had ruined it for her.

She never actually got the chance to teach, only to replace. She had no chance to see what she could do because she had to spend all of her time worrying about what I would do. I suspect that by the time my leave was over she really hated me. I am sure she was so worried about scheduling that she missed the joy of teaching, and I take full responsibility for that.

So, what have I learned from this experience? If I were going to take another maternity leave (which, I assure you, I am not), what would I do differently? Mostly, I guess, I would relax. Oh, I would still make photocopies of all of my original materials, but I would keep them for myself as backups. Then I would hand my replacement my courses of study and my file cabinet keys, and I would tell her to have fun. I would remember that there is no one way to reach students, and, with that in mind, I would ask my replacement to leave *me* notes. Finally, I would remember what it is like to be fresh out of college and ready to try my hand at teaching, and I would stand back and let that happen.

Had I taken this outlook to begin with, I might have helped my long-term substitute feel like a teacher, not a replacement. I would probably have made a friend rather than an enemy, and I surely would not have wasted three weeks' worth of planning periods.

CREATING A CLIMATE FOR LEADERSHIP

by Susan Benjamin
Highland Park High School, Illinois

Every good teacher creates a climate for instruction in the classroom, an atmosphere in which students can achieve their highest potential, one in which students are helped by teachers who serve as facilitators, and one in which students and their accomplishments shine as the "stars" of the classroom. Just as a good teacher sets an atmosphere for effective instruction, department leaders must establish a climate in which effective leadership can exist and flourish. Unfortunately, department leaders cannot close a classroom door to create an environment, and their personal powers to persuade may not be as great when working with adults rather than with young people. Creating a climate for leadership is often not easy; the following suggestions may be useful in creating a climate in which leadership will be accepted and welcomed.

Keep a Low Profile

Most adults are fairly satisfied, if not comfortable, with the status quo. A department chair, as a new leader, needs time to assess the situation and the players. A new department chair would be well advised to take a low profile at the beginning, in order to set the stage for the acceptance of leadership. Then, as the new department leader becomes acclimated to the job and accepted by the staff, that chair can begin to invest others in changes.

Take the High Road

In some schools a few individuals may hope to curry favor by becoming the department insider, the "narc." A department chair should neither take nor make department confidants. Although it is wise for a department chairperson to have an open door policy, allowing anybody to feel free to speak, it is even wiser to refuse to accept negative remarks from one staff member about another. It goes without saying that a department leader should never initiate negative comments about one department member to another. A standard of allowing no backbiting will create a model for others to follow. In this way, if it is clear that the department chair does not permit one colleague's "putting down" of another, an atmosphere of trust will be established which will be carried throughout the department.

Be Positive

A department chair who wishes to lead people to do something constructive needs to be constructive with them. When a department chair must criticize, comments should be made in a positive manner with specific advice. Praise frequently, criticize sparingly and constructively: the old saying "you can catch more flies with honey" is true. While many know the value of preceding a suggestion for change with a compliment, few realize the importance of the conjunction used to connect the praise and the constructive criticism. If the conjunction is "but," the praise is negated. Therefore, when making suggestions for change, a department leader might say something such as, "your handouts to the students were excellent, *and* next time you might make sure you have more than enough for each student in the classroom."

Remain Even-tempered

In addition to having a generally positive attitude, a department leader should be sure to be even-tempered around the other members of the department. It's a funny thing but even though the department chair might be concerned about something that has nothing to do with the department and its members, if that chair greets a fellow member of the staff with a troubled frown, that individual always seems to take it personally. Occasionally when I am lost in thought and greet someone with a less-than-chipper "Hello," that teacher will ask, "What's wrong?" Because department members look to their chairperson for approval, having an even disposition is important.

Accept Responsibility

Faculty appreciate a leader who is able to take responsibility for actions and accept the blame for whatever is less than perfect. A department leader who gives credit to department members graciously when it is due may sometimes even stretch the due bill. I learned the wisdom of this from one of my own supervisors, a man who often gives me wonderful ideas to initiate and implement. When I attempt to give him the credit, he generously gives it back

to me. At the same time, when things do not go well in the department, a leader avoids blaming other department members and, instead, accepts the blame.

Rally Support

When initiating change, an effective department leader lines up supporters before going to the entire department. Support will be forthcoming if a department leader invests faculty members in the change process by empowering them to initiate change and subsequently supports those initiatives. No one feels quite so lonely as a department leader who stands in front of a department of twenty-five individuals and proposes a worthy change but receives no support.

Share the Joy

Finally, a department leader celebrates the good times. In every school, at the end of the school year, there must be something to celebrate—perhaps just the fact that all have gotten through another year together. In our department, one of the most important times seems to be the end-of-the-year department party. Although I host the party at my house and everyone contributes a special dish, what makes the party so delicious is the entertainment. Because English teachers are naturally clever and skillful with words, each year the teachers in my department present a series of skits or songs lampooning events of the year and individuals in the department, including, and especially, the chairperson. Sometimes sweet and tearful good-byes are said to retiring colleagues or other department members who are not returning the following year. Department members leave the party feeling that their colleagues are an extremely special group of people. Enhancing camaraderie and fun is important; part of establishing an effective climate for leadership is valuing the importance of fun.

The suggestions that I have offered can help establish a climate in which leadership is accepted and effective. Just as a classroom teacher does with students, a department chair can create a climate in which teachers feel joy and accomplishment in what they are doing. By rewarding teachers with frequent praise and by respecting their initiatives, an effective department leader can make teachers feel like the shining stars they truly have the potential to be.

LEADERSHIP THROUGH REFLECTIVE THINKING

by Jeanne Gerlach and Nancy Hoffman
West Virginia University

Traditionally, teachers are rarely asked to think theoretically about their teaching or to share those thoughts with others. Yet, reflective thinking is a process teachers can engage in to learn more about their teaching and their students' learning. Tradition also seems to value activities and thinking focused on practical action and to devalue activities and thinking perceived as focused on theory. Beliefs such as these may well underlie the time and space arrangements in schools which seem to say that one's teaching is to be kept a private endeavor. At the same time, the arrangement of rooms and schedules seems to deny, or at least seldom facilitate, the availability of adequate time and space conducive for teachers to reflect on their practice. While change is gradually occurring in many schools, the efforts of department leaders to promote reflection must consider the impact of traditional views of teaching.

What Is Reflective Thinking?

Reflective thinking is the ability to analytically determine the causes of a problem and to access one or more problem-solving paradigms for the solution of the problem. Through the process of reflection, teachers can identify a question, problem, or concern they might sense about a student, a teaching methodology, or the curriculum in general. Then, in order to determine a course of future action, the teachers can write about their concerns and discuss the issue with colleagues.

While any administrator can facilitate reflection by scheduling teachers so that they have time to work together, department chairs, placed as leaders of small groups of teachers in a specific content area, have unique opportunities to promote reflection. Department chairs should consider the personalities, the needs, and the interests of their faculty and then, as they carry out their work with the department or with an individual teacher, suggest plans for reflection.

Suggestions for Reflective Thinking

A chairperson might consider a range of options to promote reflective thinking about teaching in order to identify the options which might be most effective in their departments.

Keeping journals is an activity that promotes reflective thinking. Teachers can be encouraged to keep personal teaching journals which provide them with a record of their teaching experiences, their feelings, ideas, and opinions about such activities. Teachers can be encouraged to keep "floating journals," where an identified topic is commented on by all teachers and the cumulative effort is shared with all participants. Cooperating teachers or mentor teachers might share journals which reflect on their role with one another, or they might share such journals with the novice teachers with whom they are working. Cooperating teachers and student teachers can write reflective journal entries about their teaching to be shared with one another. Teachers can read student journals and respond to them in an effort to understand the student's perception of classroom activities. When teachers are involved in curriculum changes or staff development programs, they might keep journals reflecting on their own progress and feelings. These journals might be private or might be shared with others involved in the innovation.

Reflective thinking can be served by observation; teachers can observe each other as well as their students, shifting their roles between expert and novice. A pair of teachers might agree to observe one another and prepare narratives which holistically describe and analyze the educational environment observed. Reviewing audio or videotape(s) of either the teacher or the students during a class can inform writing and reflection about one's own teaching. Experienced teachers can observe beginning teachers and prepare descriptions of what they observed, raising some questions for discussion or offering some options for the novice to consider.

Finally, reflective thinking can be served by collegial sharing of readings, experiences, and writings. Reading and reacting to selected articles might stimulate teachers to relate their views to those of others and make new knowledge from the synthesis of ideas. Comments about good days can be included in a departmental yearbook to be shared with faculty members. Experienced teachers might prepare a series of weekly or monthly letters for new teachers, alerting them to upcoming units and school events, raising issues to consider, familiarizing them with resources, or offering strategies for teaching, parent conferences, etc.

Reflection and action are essential to good teaching. Reflection allows teachers to step back and slow down as they think about their concerns, raise new questions, consider options, and plan their next steps. Action involves changes in teaching that result when teachers take steps in new directions. Action based on reflection is essential to teacher growth and improved teaching.

Department chairs, blessed with a combination of close ties between faculty and leadership, are able to encourage teachers to reflect upon common concerns and the work of their department.

LEADING SCHOOLWIDE CHANGE: A PLAN FOR SUCCESS

by Terrie St. Michel
South Mountain High School, Phoenix, Arizona

At South Mountain High School in Phoenix, Arizona, students are staying in school, actively participating in the classroom and in extracurricular activities, increasing their academic achievement, investing of themselves in a variety of advanced magnet courses offered in the performing and visual arts, law, and aerospace programs, and are asking questions and feeling good about the answers.

A schoolwide restructuring, known as the South Mountain Plan, is responsible for the positive change in our South Mountain students. The Plan reformed, restructured, and renewed the educational opportunities for South Mountain students, taking as its overall mission the creation of a community of learners.

The Changes

Prior to the implementation of The Plan, 38.3 percent of all students at South Mountain received at least one failing grade; the average score for 1988 twelfth graders on statewide math and English tests was at the ninth-grade level; the 1988 absentee rate peaked at 16 percent; and one out of every four students dropped out of school. By the end of the 1989-90 school year, dramatic changes were evident: the percent of students receiving failing grades had dropped to below 33 percent; statewide test scores for math and English had increased to 10.8 (with the greatest improvement occurring in written expression); the absentee rate had dropped to 12.4 percent; and the dropout rate had been reduced from 22.3 percent in 1988 to 12.6 percent. The impact of The Plan has been profound.

The most dramatic change has been the reduction of teaching periods so that teachers of English and math teach only three class periods per day, and all other subject area teachers teach only four periods per day. Teachers spend their extra time making home visits and telephone calls, individualizing instruction, tutoring, developing new programs, and coordinating interdisciplinary activities.

However, the most significant changes were reported by the students during interviews conducted by an Arizona State University research team who set up a research base to study the South Mountain Plan. Students reported that they felt more cared about, that they had personal relationships with the South Mountain staff, that they were noticed, and most important, that they felt wanted. Students come to school at South Mountain High School and stay because they like being there.

As a teacher of English, teaching two senior English classes, and the department chair, directing a 36-member department, the reduced demands on my time in class have enabled me to involve myself more intensely with my students. I have the time to respond to their personal needs as well as their academic needs. In short, I am available. My experience has demonstrated that when students perceive themselves as included, they respond by involving themselves more intensely. Students want to be wanted and appreciated, and when this message is clearly communicated, they respond.

Another important factor contributing to the success of The Plan has been interdisciplinary teaching. At South Mountain, a block of time is created where two or more teachers share the same students. At the freshman level, these interdisciplinary blocks of time are created with English, math, and science; for ESL students (students for whom English is a second language) blocks of time are created with English, math, reading, and science. At the sophomore through senior levels, the interdisciplinary blocks are used with English and social studies. The blocks provide a vehicle by which teachers work together to plan instruction that parallels subject areas, giving students more time on task. This design also allows teachers the opportunity to monitor student progress and work together to adjust the curriculum to meet students' needs. The design also provides consistency in classroom management, grading practices, and student contact, resulting in a school-within-a-school environment for students.

As English department chair, I felt it was my responsibility to lead the way into this new territory of reform, because English is the only subject included in the interdisciplinary blocks at all levels. The English department has the opportunity to be a key factor in facilitating changes and generating continuity. The teachers of English have had the opportunity to share the responsibility for teaching the principles of verbal and written communication with other content areas—thereby enabling all of us to contribute to the improvement of reading and writing skills. I continue to encourage my department members to try out their ideas and go beyond previous limits.

The Implementation

South Mountain is an exciting and dynamic high school. The leadership of the department chairs and staff development specialist has made the many changes at South Mountain possible and gentle.

Summer workshops were held for three weeks in June and again in August prior to the start of the first year of The Plan. These workshops prepared the staff to integrate new models of organization and strategies for instruction and allowed teachers time to discuss how they would align their curricula and generate ideas for handling managerial tasks.

The ideas for the collaborative model of instruction were generated by the entire South Mountain staff (coordinated through small staff group meetings facilitated by the School Improvement Team) and then modified and refined by sharing an emerging workshop agenda with the Instructional Cabinet. The model for these collaborative efforts shows that two concerns—curricular and managerial—informed the creation of the interdisciplinary blocks. The curricular concerns included the common themes and processes of an interdisciplinary approach, its concepts and generalizations, and the actual creation of courses. The managerial concerns included attendance policies, flexible class scheduling, flexible grouping of students, frequent contact with parents, and effective tutoring. The interdisciplinary blocks, once created, in turn influenced the staff's thinking about curriculum and management questions.

The first year proved successful in getting students to school, keeping them in school, and making them feel wanted.

Prior to the second year of The Plan, the two weeks of summer workshops, again scheduled for June and August, were concerned with expanding the overall impact of The Plan. The workshops generated committees to improve the campus environment while continuing to increase student achievement and strengthen the interdisciplinary activities.

The second year again proved that student achievement and attendance could be improved and the dropout rate of our at-risk student population lowered as a result of teachers having more

time, energy, and opportunities to do what they had been trained to do. The students commented that they knew their teachers and that their teachers knew them and could very well end up on their doorstep if they failed to show up for class.

By far the greatest gains in addressing the needs of the students have been through the articulation of characteristics to be demonstrated by a graduate of South Mountain High School. Through our course offerings in science, math, English, and reading, we hoped to provide a curriculum that would foster effective communication, responsible citizenship, problem-solving abilities, personal management skills, planning for the future, and academic achievement. We felt these six characteristics would distinguish a successful graduate.

A staff development specialist, assigned exclusively to the South Mountain campus, and I developed the agenda for the June and August workshops preceding the third year of The Plan, using information and ideas compiled from input generated by the entire South Mountain staff. The final workshops to implement strategies for the integration of the characteristics of a successful graduate began with the original six characteristics and then were chunked down into manageable pieces that each teacher could use in his/her classroom. Each characteristic was given general schoolwide indicators, and then the department/area was given the task of developing course indicators, to evaluate whether the graduate demonstrated the appropriate characteristic. Some characteristics had obvious schoolwide indicators: the "communicates effectively" characteristic was indicated by a student who could speak, write, and comprehend English; the "solves problems appropriately" characteristic was indicated by a student who could use a decision-making process. Other characteristics had less obvious schoolwide indicators: the "demonstrates responsible citizenship" characteristic was indicated by a student who respects self, others, rules and regulations, and the physical environment; the "plans for the future" characteristic was indicated by a student who demonstrates knowledge of options/possibilities/alternatives, sets goals, and develops a plan of action. Some schoolwide indicators overlapped: the "academic achievement" characteristic was indicated by a student who not only met the graduation requirements and demonstrated the use of higher-order thinking but who was also prepared for post-high school employment or education and demonstrated the qualities of a life-long learner, indicators that relate to planning for the future. The characteristic labeled "applies personal management skills" had schoolwide indicators such as the demonstration of the ability to manage time and finances effectively, to practice personal hygiene and self-control, to dress appropriately, and to maintain personal and mental health. Each of these schoolwide indicators would be given appropriate objectives, integration strategies, and summarizing narratives. The ultimate goal was to foster a cohesive vision for all staff members that would directly impact South Mountain students.

At the start of the third year, the attitude among the South Mountain staff has been optimistic and excited because the teachers know that The Plan works and that they truly have opportunities to work more closely and effectively with each other, as well as with the students. The resulting attitude is that the South Mountain staff care, are dedicated to making things happen, are willing to change and try something new. Students are discovering immediate uses for the various skills they are learning through the multiple and diverse interdisciplinary activities and interwoven curricula. More time, greater communication, cross-curricular involvement, and higher expectations for students are contributing to our schoolwide goal: success for all students.

The South Mountain Plan, structured and supported by a joint effort between the Classroom Teachers' Association and the Governing Board of the Phoenix Union High School District, is working, and I am thrilled to be included.

[Author's Note. I wish to acknowledge the efforts of Arizona State University researchers, Dr. David C. Berliner and Dr. Dee Ann Spencer, and the staff development specialist, assigned exclusively to the South Mountain campus, Mary Harthun.]

CONTINUING CONCERNS OF DEPARTMENT LEADERS

by Theodore Lehmann II
Carlisle Area School District, Pennsylvania

CSSEDC brings together the continuing concerns, problems, anxieties, and talents of over two hundred department leaders each year at its annual November convention. Conversation at the conference always seems to return to several themes that dominate the lives of department leaders and teachers. A roundtable discussion during the final morning of last year's convention provided an informal but organized forum for department leaders concerned about similar problems.

Four topics emerged as being of great concern to department chairs at this meeting: coping with change, developing writing programs, handling the tracking controversy, and motivating teachers.

Coping with Change

A group that met to discuss the issue of managing change noted two particular concerns that they were facing: the introduction of writing-across-the-curriculum programs and a return to the core curriculum program rather than an elective program. The group detailed a number of approaches to helping teachers adjust to such changes in the teaching of English.

For example, the group felt chairs should provide the means to help teachers become more reflective about their teaching. Department retreats and group curriculum-writing efforts were offered as possibilities. An attractive place to gather was suggested as an aid to such efforts, one that could easily be provided in the English office, a place that is more than a location for the duplicating machine and the coffee maker.

They suggested that consultants could assist teachers more effectively by coming into the classroom than by removing teachers to attend inservice meetings. Teachers facing change would have these changes facilitated by being provided with common planning time, working in teaching teams, and being placed in intentional support groups. Teaming those teachers most in need of growth with those teachers most able to provide help was suggested as an approach to promoting change in the profession.

One teacher's remark, "Routines protect teachers," occasioned discussion about the nature of change. The idea of promoting change includes the idea of permitting it to occur, and this is possible only in an atmosphere of acceptance. Teachers should be freed to move in new and exciting directions that they discover. As a chair, one should reveal a concern for colleagues, helping teachers to risk by focusing on what teachers already do well. Teachers should always be viewed as professionals, and department leaders must resist the tendency to be fault-finding. Change is more likely to occur in an environment of recognition and permission-giving than in one of blame and fault-finding.

Developing Writing Programs

A group that met to discuss the issue of the development of young writers discussed differences in beliefs about the way that writing

develops, the nature of school writing, and how students should be prepared for the challenges of writing they will have to produce after high school.

The concerns about writing grew out of the perceived differences in the ways in which writing is practiced at the elementary, middle school, and high school levels. The participants emphasized the importance of teaching "process" approaches but felt a need to prepare students for more formal writing such as that expected in college writing, a need seen by some as being in conflict with the process approach and one compounded by the growing popularity of whole language approaches. Some participants thought that there should be a sequence of writing development in which process is taught early while modes and types of writing, with particular emphasis on exposition, should be taught later. Others suggested that responsible English teachers should prepare students for timed writing experiences since such writing was a "present and future reality" for most students. Still other participants believed that while formal writing is necessary, it should be taught within a context of process.

There remain genuine conflicts of both values about writing and understanding how writing develops. It is clear from the responses of the participants that the ideas of the National Writing Project as well as the work of people like Lucy Calkins and Nancie Atwell have had a profound effect on teachers of writing. Leaders in English departments need to continue to clarify their ideas about how writing develops in children and how K–12 composition programs can be designed to prepare students for a variety of kinds of writing. The role of collaboration in producing good writing, the extent to which writing should be in response to literature, and where learning logs, journals, and other personal writing fit into school writing also continue as lively concerns.

Handling the Tracking Controversy

The response of the group that met to discuss handling the tracking controversy indicates that tracking may be the most difficult area confronting the leaders in English departments. Participants who discussed the issue of tracking expressed concern about the research on heterogeneous versus homogeneous groupings. They debated whether changes in this area were merely the result of an educational pendulum swing or represented a real move in educational philosophy. They were concerned that while heterogeneous grouping might be effective in middle schools, as it corresponds with middle school philosophy, it might be more difficult from both educational and political perspectives to implement in the high school.

The participants discussed community pressures for and against various grouping patterns, for example, the support for heterogeneous grouping reported from middle and upper-middle income parents of middle school youngsters. It was suggested that many parents do not fully understand current ideas about many areas of education, relying as they do upon their own educational experiences as the touchstone for quality. Others felt the community pressures unduly influenced by the reported success of the Japanese in education. Nevertheless, the participants expressed confidence that the community could be a powerful ally if educators found the will and confidence to educate parents.

Tracking issues seemed to be related to a variety of issues revolving around developments in educational theory and practice: questions of standards, appropriate teaching strategies, collaborative learning devices, developmental readiness at various levels, need for small classes, and classroom management.

Motivating Teachers

A group addressing the question "How can teachers be motivated?" saw a variety of problems and appeared to find itself caught in the middle between administrators and stagnant teachers. Participants expressed frustration at expectations for change from unreasonable administrators who did not recognize the problems with which department chairs must deal nor were these administrators willing to delegate sufficient authority to the chairs to make motivating teachers a real possibility.

This group emphasized the importance of the department chair's staying focused on the specific areas viewed as being important. Participants warned against trying to do too many new things. The correlative of this injunction is to avoid getting bogged down in the trivial. Chairs should keep trying to find ways to help department members develop ideas and concepts in their classrooms. Within this context, it becomes most important for chairs to watch their own behavior—being careful not to overload teachers, being sensitive about when, how, and where to make suggestions, and continuing to have clear and open agendas for faculty development.

Motivation revolves around continuing to emphasize the positive: helping faculty members to see the excellence in their own teaching and the results of their change, helping top administrators to know about the activities of faculty members, and encouraging public recognition of teacher excellence.

Finally, participants believed teachers must develop ownership of the ideas their chair is seeking to develop; faculty must develop the ideas, build the programs, and view themselves as essential components of the process. Chairs must recognize that motivation and change are often slow to develop but will emerge if patience is exercised.

Implications

The CSSEDC roundtable meeting represented the coming together of minds ready to grow and develop their own leadership skills. The results demonstrated the quality of thinking that can emerge from informal gatherings, even at the end of a demanding three-day convention. The intensity of the discussions suggests a need for informal opportunities for department chairs to discuss, develop, and work with ideas heard at conferences. CSSEDC provides a forum and a setting for support and personal growth for English department chairs who spend many long months coping with their daily problems in relative isolation.

[Author's Note. My thanks to Ann Renninger, Joe Komadina, Reiny Pierson, and Vicki Polinka for facilitating the small groups at the "Pick Your Poison and a Chair Has the Antidote" roundtable and for providing me with their notes. Since I was unable to be present during all the discussions in each of the groups, I have taken some liberties in developing the ideas presented in the notes given to me by these helpful people.]

TRADITIONAL AND ROMANTIC VIEWS OF TEACHERS

by Robert C. Small, Jr.
Virginia Tech, Blacksburg, Virginia

Teachers may be looked at in many ways. Some young children see their teachers as warm, motherly people who help them to have fun and to find out things they want to know. Some other children see their teachers as sarcastic, critical monsters who hold them up

to ridicule. And our current emotional definition of teacher probably has more to do with our own childhood experience with teachers than with our reading of theory and research. Nevertheless, what an English teacher is and should be can be looked at in other ways. How do those who are charged with leading the teachers—the supervisors, the principals, the department chairs, the field supervisors—see teachers? I would label the conflicting views of teaching as the traditional and the romantic views. The traditional view of a teacher is one that has been prominent in practice for most of the history of elementary and secondary education in this country.

The Traditional View

The traditional view of the teacher consists of a number of beliefs and assumptions, some of which are made in Judith Lanier and Judith Little's review of research on teacher education (*Handbook of Research on Teaching*, 3rd ed., Macmillan, 1986, pp. 527–69).

In the traditional view, most teachers in elementary and secondary schools are women from the middle class or men from the lower class, teachers who grew up in homes that stressed conformist values, authoritarian conservatism, and other-directedness. Furthermore, female teachers, in the traditional view, are encouraged by their own elementary and secondary education to be passive, functioning primarily as followers. During their elementary and secondary school years, these teachers, as children of the working class, were discouraged from developing substantive, ideational flexibility. Instead, moralistic and utilitarian views of knowledge encouraging conformist values and cognitive passivity were emphasized for working-class children. Their formal education emphasized domestic roles for women in America, while de-emphasizing the intellectual prowess of women. The content of the graduate curriculum in education, the part-time nature of their graduate studies, and the professors who teach such courses all seem to reinforce conformist values and a narrowness of perspective.

And so, the education of teachers according to the traditional view has not been highly liberating, at least not in a way that would counter family nurtured and school-reinforced tendencies to value cognitive conformity, and classroom teaching according to the traditional view does little to further the complex intellectual development of the adults who work there.

Thus, in this traditional view, teachers are mostly conformist-minded women, who will leave teaching after a few years to marry and rear their children. Few teachers will, therefore, spend enough time actually teaching in order to learn much about what it is they are doing. Neither the male nor the female teachers will be educated much beyond rote learning; and their college teachers, by and large, will be people like themselves. It is, therefore, in this view of teaching, neither possible nor desirable for teachers to make decisions about what should or could be learned by their students nor, for the most part, to decide how those students should be taught.

However, a few teachers, for the most part males, who show promise, despite their unpromising backgrounds, receive a somewhat more thorough education in order to become the managers—leaders, if you will—of the rest. The mission of schools of education seems to be the preparation of an elite minority who will become the managers of the majority, that is, those lower-status women and less able men who comprise the massive teaching force.

The traditional view of a teacher is that of a noninquiring, non-self-directed female worker following out the dictates of her better-trained, male managers. These male managers, it might also be suggested, are expected to carry out the general orders of their bosses, that is, the influential citizens and scholars. What kind of leadership might best ensure that such workers follow orders and complete their assigned tasks?

A teacher's first task would be to understand the objectives set for the day by the manager. Next, that teacher would need to understand what tools are available to accomplish those objectives: that is, in educational terms, what "materials" the manager has chosen to make available. This traditional teacher would need to understand next what courses of action were established or, at least, permitted for accomplishing those goals: that is, again in educational terms, what "activities" the teacher should or could use to teach the children in her care. Finally, a traditional teacher would be expected to measure the degree to which the preordained goals had been met and to submit evidence of successes and failures to the manager: that is, evaluate the students, passing some, failing others.

If this sounds familiar, it should; for it is the lesson planning process taught in most education methods courses and described with approbation in most methods and curriculum texts. It is sometimes called the "Ralph Tyler" model, though, if one reads what Tyler himself wrote, one will discover that authoritarianism seems to have played a considerably smaller part in his thinking than it did in that of his followers, the textbook publishers.

The Romantic View

Another way of looking at what a teacher should be, the romantic view, is reflected in the most recent NCTE *Guidelines for the Preparation of Teachers of the English Language Arts* (1986, pp. 18–21).

In the romantic view, teachers should be "serious students of teaching. That is, they need to explore extensively the strategies that are likely to be most successful in teaching various aspects of their subject. They should [ask themselves] such questions [about instructional activities] as 'Why is it being done?' 'Did it work?' 'Why did it work?' 'How does it work?'" In this model, teachers see themselves as classroom researchers, investigators who learn about language and literature by staying current with research findings and by studying their own students' interests and activities. "Such teachers see themselves as engaged in the act of learning, as well as in teaching; therefore, they are active professionally."

In the romantic view, teachers ask questions that "tap a variety of their students' cognitive abilities and elicit thoughtful oral and written responses. They encourage students' self-questioning behaviors and self-monitoring of comprehension. They also promote discussions leading to rich interpretations of texts." In addition, they "choose, design, and apply evaluations that reveal students' strengths and weaknesses more to chart growth than to determine grades."

Teachers who value "invention, discovery, and growth [as well as] experimentation with instructional procedures [perceive] themselves as students of teaching who continue to grow as individuals" and "see teaching as a dynamic profession rather than a static activity."

What is altered if a teacher is viewed as a decision maker, inquirer, researcher, and experimenter rather than as an implementer of someone else's decisions? What kind of leadership is offered for this teacher?

The outline of an answer should already be clear. Planning a unit is, in many ways, like writing a play: it starts with discovery and invention, moves on to creation, then to trial, reflection, and revision. The author and the planner both brainstorm, meditate, sleep on ideas, make lists, pace up and down. Then they write. Then they rewrite and rewrite again.

When the play is written, the author and producer—the teacher and the manager—take it on the road. Scenes work; other scenes do not. They revise in Omaha; they revise in Peoria. Teachers take their lesson plans on the road with their second period classes, with an advantage that a playwright does not have—knowing the audience in advance. Then these teachers revise, try again with the 4th period, and revise again. A play may get to Broadway finally, while lesson units are always on the road, always under revision. This romantic planning model makes success a joy, failure a frustrating but profitable basis for reworking.

Implications

If asked, nearly every teacher educator I know, every professor, every CSSEDC member, every clinical faculty member would claim to be working to prepare the kind of inquiring, experimenting, researching, exploring, inventing teacher that the NCTE *Guidelines* call for. But, too often, in our teacher education programs, on college campuses, observing in schools, during student teaching, we approach teaching as the dreary implementation of predetermined objectives involving little choice by the teacher. When we place student teachers with teachers who plan—or, more likely, are forced to plan—in that way, we tell our prospective teachers that teaching is, after all, a low-grade, mechanistic job. Instead, our schools need to be structured so that teachers who invent, inquire, and experiment are seen as those who are the most qualified to lead student teachers, neophyte teachers, fellow department members, and the graduate school educators.

TEAM BUILDING: CONNECTING SUBSTANCE TO EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP

by Henry Kiernan
Southern Regional High School, Manahawkin, New Jersey

Educational leadership is shaped by collections of groups interacting with one another, as they formally and informally cooperate and compete with one another, form coalitions, and bargain with each other. Long before quality circles, before shared decision making, and before school-based management, we tried to identify the qualities of educational leadership. We asked how leadership is different from management. We asked how leadership is exercised within a framework that values independence. We asked how our appreciation and knowledge of the subtleties inherent in our own leadership practices and those of our colleagues can be extended. And while we enhanced our research base and focused our questions, the debate continued concerning the relationship between leadership and management, and the relationship between the identity of individuals and the integration of groups.

The decisions made by school leaders are often the consequence of the interaction of groups of individuals within the school. Unfortunately, given the power of groups within schools, most educational leaders lack the knowledge and skills needed to work collaboratively with teams of individuals. In fact, school leaders concentrate their efforts on managing teachers and colleagues rather than building effective teams, perhaps because their own lateral and supervisory relationships are constructed on a one-on-one, manager-subordinate basis. Beyond focusing on leadership style and its visible behaviors, we need to consider team building as a way of connecting substance to leadership.

Building a Team

My own experience with team building began four years ago when the Southern Regional High School District connected its staff development programs to team-based school improvement efforts. Previous staff development activities focused solely on isolated events where teachers and administrators would attend a professional workshop, read professional journals, or pursue graduate study. Staff development remained a rather isolated, insular activity that rarely went beyond an individual office or classroom.

Initially, our team building for school administrators and department supervisors involved training in recognizing individual and collective leadership and learning styles. When strengths were matched to fit district goals, school leaders working collaboratively as a team developed a set of beliefs about what leadership and learning should be and agreed upon a set of standards and values to which they would adhere.

Staff development no longer became an autonomous "one-shot deal," but rather an on-going, multidisciplinary process that fostered the idea of a learning community. Once our school leaders developed their own team approach toward goal setting and decision making, our teachers were organized into teams led by teachers. The administrative team's goal became providing opportunities for teachers to become leaders, to share in the responsibility of decision making, and to develop a sense of achievement.

The Value of Conflict

While the substance of leadership deals with content and direction, in a team environment it also stimulates controversy. Given the confusing pull between the myth and reality of educational leadership, the team building process becomes paramount to clarify roles and to bring personalities into synchronization with the goals of the organization. Team relationships require a sense of dependence among team members. The team building process is especially necessary when devising a leadership environment where members of the team feel compelled to consider several points of view in order to solve a problem. A feeling of trust built upon an agreement to disagree is similar to the assertion of Rosabeth Kanter (*Changemasters*, Simon & Schuster, 1983): "It is not the 'caution of committees' that is sought—reducing risk by spreading responsibility—but the better idea that comes from a clash and an integration of perspectives" (p. 167). Most important, building a team requires leaders committed to making a vision for change become a reality, rather than team members who react to change. Thus, a team becomes the motivating network of individuals who choose to support a vision and follow it through to reality. The emphasis on team building is driven by a sense of connection and is strengthened by sharing, by being oneself. Rather than focusing on a sense of constraint with an emphasis on being alike, the individual and the group share control through purposeful self-direction, independence, and self-confidence.

The Individual

In our culture the individual possesses far more standing than the group. Much of the initial pronouncements from the research on effective schools stressed the importance of the leadership style of the building principal. While it is true that a strong principal may positively influence a school's learning environment, the

danger lies in the presumption of accomplishment solely by any individual. This dependence on the role of the individual ultimately implies the presumption of inaction by committee or group. As Kenneth Galbraith (*The New Industrial State*, Free Press, 1977) reminds us, "Because individuals have more standing in the culture than organizations, they regularly get credit for achievement that belongs, in fact, to organization" (p. 89). To assert the preeminence of groups over the individual is as challenging a prospect for schools as it is for other organizations. Yet, it is a necessary assertion.

Team building at Southern Regional served as an effective mechanism for fostering a unified commitment to tackling the real issues of the teaching/learning process. The sense of action through team building was most vividly observed in our restructuring of department and faculty meetings. Indeed, the importance of collegiality in promoting learning and direct communication among teachers dramatically changed the purpose of these meetings. Our district transformed department and faculty meetings into opportunities for teams of teachers to establish a set of beliefs about what teaching and learning should be and to develop an ongoing assessment of the application of these beliefs, rather than continuing the all-too-familiar approach of administrators presenting information to teachers, telling them how, what, and when to think. Teachers deserve more than mere regulating, delegating, and evaluating.

The Team

The mythology surrounding the notion of "team" holds that, because they are now a "team," differences among members do not exist, and therefore it is not legitimate to acknowledge or speak about them. There is a delicate balance between functioning well interdependently in groups and functioning well independently on our own. We can either be dependent and equal with others in the group or independent and alone, as the myth polarizes the choices. "Everyone acts as if they were all sharing equally in the operations of the group," says Rosabeth Kanter. "While inside the team," she continues, "they have to pretend that they do not see that some are more able than others, or that the team leader is railroading another decision through, or that the highest-level people are dominating" (p. 262).

For team building to succeed, team leaders must accept that most achievements depend on individual effort, risk taking, and perseverance. Significant events occur because of one individual's ability to relate to others with understanding, acceptance, and sensitivity. Interpersonal skills matter. John Kotter (*The Use of Power and Influence*, Free Press, 1985) asserts that organizational excellence depends on individual excellence, requiring "a sophisticated type of social skill: a leadership skill that can mobilize people and accomplish important objectives despite dozens of obstacles; a skill that can pull people together for meaningful purposes despite the thousands of forces that push us apart; a skill that can keep our important corporations and public institutions from descending into a mediocrity characterized by bureaucratic infighting, parochial politics, and vicious power struggles" (p. 38). However, there is danger that too much emphasis will be placed on interpersonal relations, particularly cooperation, at the expense of achieving substance.

Increased interdependence-based school leadership requires a much larger number of people who have leadership skills, both cognitive and interpersonal. These skills involve the ability to perceive differences in goals and beliefs among people and the ability to implement change by motivating a network of diverse groups of individuals. The more we can develop a support system of people who understand what our vision entails, the more we will be prepared for what actually occurs.

However, rarely are all individuals equally invested in the team effort and equally prepared to plan strategies to achieve the vision. Furthermore, in schools as well as other social organizations, territoriality or "issues of turf" undermine initiatives which directly or indirectly threaten the power of departments and/or individuals. Beyond increasing the substance of leadership, a degree of turbulence is necessary and expected in order to develop an effective team, one that uses the various levels of individual differences and commitment in order to develop an effective unit, one that is both powerful and affiliative.

Conflict can strengthen the team building process. When it is openly recognized at the beginning, conflict can serve to test the merit of ideas against direct challenges from others; it can stimulate other points of view as long as individual team members do not assert their own views at the expense of not recognizing others. It is the team leader's responsibility to steer the resolution of any conflict in a direct and responsive way.

Searching for common ground in education often appears elusive, but must be sought. In effective teams, diversity establishes common ground through shared goals and expectations. In other words, by identifying mutual benefits a team leader diffuses opposition and/or submerged conflict in a direct and responsive way.

For example, one of our district goals was to develop a uniform guide for teaching research writing across the curriculum. A multidisciplinary team of teachers and administrators met to address the diverse needs of content areas, to assess the best teaching practices and to design models for students to evaluate. By identifying mutual benefits throughout the process of integrating different points of view, conflicts were reduced and the group collectively reached the best solutions for the district's research writing guide.

By dealing with proclivities as well as aversions and by dealing with similarities as well as differences, leaders can begin to weigh the balance between directness and responsiveness, between myth and reality. The team building process can become a catalyst for change and effectiveness when it integrates different points of view and explores a wide range of alternative possibilities. As a mechanism to develop solutions, teams collectively accomplish more than any could accomplish alone.

School leaders would do well to design team building processes to enhance the sense of vision, to help align strategies to achieve common goals and to provide the impetus for setting the agenda for change. In a turbulent, changing world the team building process can provide school leaders with the courage to act rather than to rely on the illusory comfort of reaction, on past policies and procedures, on paralysis by analysis. Knowing when to move a school and community from paralyzing discord and toward a vision of the common good, school leaders can strike the balance between leadership's substance and style, between its myth and reality.

CALLS FOR MANUSCRIPTS—PLANS FOR FUTURE ISSUES

The *CSSEDC Quarterly*, a publication of the Conference for Secondary School English Department Chairpersons of NCTE, seeks articles of 250–3,000 words on topics of interest to English department leaders. Informal, firsthand accounts of successful department activities are encouraged.

Recent surveys of our readers reveal these topics of interest: leadership training for the new department chair, class size/class load, support from the business community, at-risk student programs, problems for rural schools, reading/writing centers, and whole language curriculum. Short articles on these and other concerns are published in every issue. In addition, upcoming issues will have these themes:

May 1991 (February 1 deadline):
The Learning Labels: At-risk; LD; Dyslexia; Remedial

October 1991 (July 1 deadline):
The Changing Literature Class

December 1991 (September 15 deadline):
Measures of Student Performance

February 1992 (November 1, 1991 deadline):
Reading and Writing Connections

Manuscripts may be sent on 5.25- or 3.5-inch floppy disks, with IBM compatible ASCII files or as traditional double-spaced, typed copy.

Address articles and inquiries to: James Strickland, Editor, *CSSEDC Quarterly*, English Department, Slippery Rock University of Pennsylvania, 16057-1326.

CSSEDC APPROVES NAME CHANGE

Because CSSEDC membership is no longer limited to secondary English leaders, our current name defines us too narrowly. Many of us have middle school, college, or K–12 responsibilities. At the recent conference in Atlanta, the CSSEDC Executive Committee, acting upon the approval of its voting membership, recommended to the Executive Board of NCTE that the name of the organization be changed to Conference on English Leadership (CEL).

If the recommended name change gains NCTE approval, expect to see the new name used for the first time in the February issue of the *Quarterly*. Also, be overjoyed by the fact that we now have an acronym that is pronounceable!

Myles D. Eley, Chair
Conference on English Leadership

CSSEDC ELECTION RESULTS

Winners of the CSSEDC election were announced at the 1990 CSSEDC Conference in Atlanta. Paul Bellin, Weld County School District #6, Greeley, Colorado, was elected Associate Chair. Also, Kristina M. Elias, West Hartford Public Schools, Connecticut, and Daniel A. Heller, Brattleboro Union High School, Vermont, were elected Members-at-Large. Congratulations to the winners and thanks to all other candidates.

CSSEDC Executive Committee

Chair
Myles Eley
Warren Central High School
9500 East 16th Street
Indianapolis, IN 46229

Associate Chair
Paul C. Bellin
Weld County School District #6
811 15th Street
Greeley, CO 80631

Past Chair
Wendell Schwartz
Stevenson High School
1670 West Highway 22
Prairie View, IL 60069

Liaison to NCTE Secondary Section Committee
Mary Sue Gardetto
Ankeney Junior High School
4085 Shakertown Road
Beavercreek, OH 45430

Corresponding Secretary
Susan Hayles-Berbower
Huntington Beach UHSD
10251 Yorktown Avenue
Huntington Beach, CA 92646

Membership Chair
Mary Ellen Thornton
Patrick Henry Middle School
Houston, TX 77093

Secretary-Treasurer
Miles Myers
NCTE

Staff Liaison
L. Jane Christensen
NCTE

Members-at-Large
Susan Benjamin
Highland Park High School
433 Vine
Highland Park, IL 60035

Kristina M. Elias
West Hartford Public Schools
West Hartford, CT 06117

Thomas Fischer
Lyons Township High School
100 S. Brainard Avenue
LaGrange, IL 60525

Ira Hayes
Syosset High School
South Woods Road
Syosset, NY 11791

Daniel A. Heller
Brattleboro Union High School
Brattleboro, VT 05301

Deborah Smith McCullar
Dean Morgan Junior High School
1440 S. Elm
Casper, WY 82601

CSSEDC QUARTERLY
National Council of Teachers of English
1111 Kenyon Road
Urbana, Illinois 61801

Nonprofit Organization
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
Champaign, Illinois
Permit No. 85